

Pacific coast; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of sundry manufacturers and merchants of Hartford, Conn., protesting against the free entry of Philippine cigars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MADDEN: Petition of the National Business Houses of America, protesting against features of the tariff bill relative to the collection of customs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of the Illinois Pharmaceutical Association, favoring House bill 1, relative to members of the Army Hospital Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

MONDAY, July 14, 1913.

The Senate met at 2 o'clock p. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday last was read and approved.

COST OF ARMOR PLATE (S. DOC. NO. 129).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, in response to a resolution of May 27, 1913, certain information relative to armor plate and its manufacture, which, on motion of Mr. ASHURST, was, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

CHARGES ON UNCLAIMED GOODS (S. DOC. NO. 130).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 2963 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relative to the charges to be paid on unclaimed goods in the hands of collectors of customs, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of 30,000 copies of the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. OLIVER. I present a concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to the condemnation and purchase by the United States Government of a certain tract of land for the use of the United States arsenal at Frankford, Philadelphia, Pa. I ask that the concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania 53.

IN THE SENATE, May 19, 1913.

Whereas the United States arsenal at Frankford, in Philadelphia, occupies a territory much too limited for its experimental work and for the proper location of its magazines for storing ammunition and explosives; and

Whereas there is, immediately adjacent to the Frankford Arsenal, an undeveloped tract of land of about 20 acres, which is suitable in every way for experimental work and for the storing of ammunition and explosives under safe conditions: Therefore be it

Resolved (if the house of representatives concur), That the attention of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from Pennsylvania is hereby invited to the need for the condemnation and purchase of this land, and said Senators and Representatives are hereby respectfully urged to secure the necessary legislation for the procurement of the said tract of land for the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the Commonwealth be directed to send to each Senator and Representative in the Congress of the United States from Pennsylvania a certified copy of this resolution.

I hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of the resolution passed in the Senate on May 19, 1913.

HARMON M. KEPHART,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

Concurred in by the house of representatives May 5, 1913.

THOMAS H. GARVIN,
Chief Clerk House of Representatives.

Approved the 19th day of June, A. D. 1913.

JOHN K. TENNER.

The foregoing is a true and correct copy of concurrent resolution of the general assembly No. 53.

ROBERT MCAFEE,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Mr. OLIVER presented a resolution adopted by the State Launderers' Association of Pennsylvania and a memorial of the Board of Trade of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the adoption of 1-cent letter postage, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Pittsburgh Chapter, American Institute of Architects, of Pennsylvania, praying that statuary and works of art be placed on the free list, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. NORRIS. I present resolutions adopted by the Nebraska Branch of the National Association of Assistant Postmasters, in convention at Lincoln, Nebr., June 16, 1913, favoring the enactment of legislation placing positions in the Post Office Department, excepting that of the Postmaster General, in the competitive classified civil service, and so forth, and I ask that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions adopted by the Nebraska Branch of the National Association of Assistant Postmasters at Lincoln, Nebr., June 16, 1913.

We, the members of the Nebraska State Association of Assistant Postmasters in convention assembled, having met for the purpose of mutual benefit, protection, and instruction and to consider and discuss the things that will make for the betterment of the postal service, do heartily recommend the adoption of the following resolutions:

Resolved, That we note with pleasure the attitude taken by President Wilson and the honorable Postmaster General in relation to the civil service and their evident determination to maintain and preserve the present status of the service and their expressed intention to extend its benefits to first, second, and third class postmasters in the near future, with a view that ultimately the entire Post Office Department and all positions connected therewith may be firmly established and conducted on a strictly business basis and entirely removed and separated from political activity and influence; and be it further

Resolved, That in furtherance of this purpose and to hasten its adoption we heartily indorse Senate bill No. 724, introduced and prepared by George W. Norris, United States Senator from Nebraska, having for its purpose the placing of all positions in the Post Office Department, excepting Postmaster General, in the competitive classified civil service, and providing for promotions and transfers from lower to higher positions and for adjusting the salaries of assistant postmasters in proportion to the duties involved and responsibilities assumed.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented memorials of sundry citizens of Battle Creek, Grand Rapids, Pottsville, and Berrien Springs, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. WEEKS presented resolutions adopted by the Fruit and Produce Exchange of Boston, Mass., favoring the adoption of 1-cent letter postage, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NEWLANDS:

A bill (S. 2739) to create a waterways commission and a board of river regulation to promote interstate commerce by the development and improvement of the rivers and waterways and water resources of the United States and the coordination of and cooperation between rail and water routes, and by providing a fund for the regulation and control of the flow of rivers and for the maintenance at all seasons of a navigable stage of water in waterways and for the connection of rivers and waterways with the Great Lakes and with each other, and as a means to that end to provide for flood prevention and protection, and for water storage, and for the beneficial use of flood waters for irrigation and water power, and for the conservation and use of water in agriculture, and for the protection of watersheds from denudation and erosion, and from forest fires, and for the cooperation in such work of Government services and bureaus with each other and with States, municipalities, and for local agencies.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. BURTON. The question of the reference of a similar bill came up at the last Congress. I think it should go to the Committee on Commerce. Clearly that is where it belongs.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I shall contend that the bill should go to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, but I know that there will be debate upon that subject, and I ask that the bill be printed and lie on the table at present, until a proper reference can be made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I ask that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A bill (S. 2739) to create a waterways commission and a board of river regulation to promote interstate commerce by the development and improvement of the rivers and waterways and water resources of the United States and the coordination of and cooperation between rail and water routes, and by providing a fund for the regulation and control of the flow of rivers and for the maintenance at all seasons of a navigable stage of water in waterways and for the connection of rivers and waterways with the Great Lakes and with each other, and as a means to that end to provide for flood prevention and protection and for water storage and for the beneficial use of flood waters for irrigation and water power, and for the conservation and use of water in agriculture, and for the protection of watersheds from denudation and erosion and from forest fires, and for the cooperation in such work of Government services and bureaus with each other and with States, municipalities, and other local agencies.

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of \$60,000,000 annually for each of the 10 years following the first day of July, 1913, is hereby reserved, set aside, and appropriated, and made available until expended, out of any moneys not otherwise appropriated, as a special fund in the Treasury, to be known as the river regulation fund, to be used to promote interstate commerce by the development and improvement of the rivers and waterways of the United States and their connections with the Great Lakes and with each other, and by the coordination of and cooperation between rail and water routes and transportation, and the establishment and maintenance of adequate terminal and transfer facilities and systems and their maintenance, improvement, and protection, and by the making of examinations and surveys and by the construction of engineering and other works and projects for the regulation and control of the flow of rivers and their tributaries and source streams, and the standardization of such flow, and by the maintenance of navigable stages of water at all seasons of the year in the waterways of the United States, and by preventing silt and sedimentary material from being carried into and deposited in waterways, channels, and harbors, and by the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of the United States, and by flood prevention and protection through the establishment, construction, and maintenance of natural and artificial reservoirs for water storage and control, and the protection of watersheds from denudation, erosion, and surface wash, and from forest fires, and the maintenance and extension of woodland and other protective cover thereon, and the reclamation of swamp and overflow lands and arid lands, and the building of drainage and irrigation works in order that the flow of rivers shall be regulated and controlled not only through the use of flood waters for irrigation on the upper tributaries, but also through controlling them in fixed and established channels in the lower valleys and plains, and by doing all things necessary to provide for any and all beneficial uses of water that will contribute to its conservation or storage in the ground or in surface reservoirs as an aid to the regulation or control of the flow of rivers, and by acquiring, holding, using, and transferring lands and any other property that may be needed for the aforesaid purposes, and by doing such other things as may be specified in this act or necessary to the accomplishment of the purposes thereof, and by securing the cooperation therein of States, municipalities, and other local agencies, as hereinafter set forth, and for the payment of all expenditures provided for in this act; the ultimate purpose of this act being the maintenance at all times of a navigable stage of water in all inland waterways, and flood prevention and protection, and river regulation and the control of the volume of water forming the stage of the river from its sources, so as to standardize the river flow, as contradistinguished from and supplemental to channel improvement as heretofore undertaken and provided for under the various acts commonly known as river and harbor acts.

CREATION OF THE WATERWAYS COMMISSION AND THE BOARD OF RIVER REGULATION.

SEC. 2. That a commission is hereby created, to be known as the waterways commission, consisting of the President of the United States, who shall be the chairman of said commission, with the power of veto, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the chairman of the board of river regulation, to be appointed as hereinafter provided. The chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the chairman of the Panama Canal Commission shall be ex officio advisory members of said waterways commission.

The waterways commission shall have authority to direct and control all proceedings and operations and all things done or to be done under this act, and to establish all rules and regulations which may be in their judgment be necessary to carry into effect such direction and control consistent with the provisions of this act and with existing law and with any provisions which Congress may from time to time enact.

All plans and estimates prepared by the board of river regulation, as hereinafter provided, which contemplate or provide for expenditures from the river-regulation fund, shall be submitted to the waterways commission for final approval before any of the expenditures therein provided for or contemplated are authorized or made, or any construction work undertaken or contracts let under or in pursuance of such plans: *Provided*, That in case of an emergency the chairman of the board of river regulation shall have full power to act, and shall report in detail his action in every case to the waterways commission at its next meeting after his action.

The members of said commission shall serve as such only during their incumbency in their respective official positions, and any vacancy on the commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

A board is hereby created to be known as the board of river regulation, consisting of the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, the chairman of the Mississippi River Commission, the Director of the United States Geological Survey, the Director of the Reclamation Service, the Forester of the Department of Agriculture, the Chief of the Bureau of Plant Industry of the Department of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, one civil engineer, one sanitary engineer, one hydroelectric engineer, one expert in transportation, and a chairman of the board. The last five shall be appointed by the President and hold office at their pleasure, and they shall each receive an annual compensation of \$10,000, except the chairman, who shall receive \$12,000, and they shall receive a per diem in lieu of actual expenses when absent from headquarters on official business, to be determined by the waterways commission. Such compensation and per diem, together with all the general expenses of the board, shall be payable out of the appropriation hereinafter apportioned to the Smithsonian Institution.

The members of said board, with the exception of the five members appointed by the President, shall serve as such only during their incumbency in their respective official positions, and any vacancy on the board shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

The five members of the board appointed by the President shall constitute an executive committee of which the chairman of the board shall be chairman, and said executive committee shall have the general executive direction and supervision of the operations of said board of river regulation under rules and regulations to be established by the waterways commission.

A secretary of the board shall be appointed by the executive committee, and shall hold office at their pleasure, and he shall receive an annual compensation of \$5,000 and a per diem when absent from headquarters on official business to be determined by the waterways commission, payable out of the appropriation hereinafter apportioned for the Smithsonian Institution.

All formal action taken and all expenditures made or authorized by the board of river regulation shall be reported to the waterways commission, and shall be by the commission transmitted to Congress annually or at such more frequent times as may appear to the commission desirable or at such times as Congress may require.

Whenever, in their judgment, it may be advisable, in order to expedite construction, the waterways commission may order such construction work as they may determine to be done under the immediate direction, by contract or otherwise, of the executive committee, in which case such work shall be paid for from the apportionment of the service or bureau or organization under which it would otherwise have been done; such transfer and application of any apportionment made by this act being hereby authorized.

The waterways commission shall further have power to temporarily provide for disbursements under this act, other than those above provided for, by transfers from one apportionment hereunder to another: *Provided, however*, That such transfers shall be equalized and the money so diverted restored to the apportionment from which it was transferred, as nearly as may be, within the period of 10 years covered by this act.

The waterways commission may, if at any time it shall be in their judgment advisable, appoint from the public service additional members of the board of river regulation; and they may also create and appoint from the public service the members of subordinate boards or commissions to promote the purposes of this act and expedite and facilitate the administration thereof and operations and construction thereunder.

COOPERATION WITH STATES, MUNICIPALITIES, AND OTHER AGENCIES.

SEC. 3. That the board of river regulation shall, in all cases where possible and practicable, encourage, promote, and endeavor to secure the cooperation of States, municipalities, public and quasi-public corporations, towns, counties, districts, communities, persons, and associations in the carrying out of the purposes and objects of this act, and in making the investigations and doing all coordinative and constructive work provided for herein; and it shall in each case endeavor to secure the financial cooperation of States and of such local authorities, agencies, and organizations to an extent at least equal in amount to the sum expended by the United States; and it shall negotiate and perfect arrangements and plans for the apportionment of work, cost, and benefits, according to the jurisdiction, powers, rights, and benefits of each, respectively, and with a view to assigning to the United States such portion of such development, promotion, regulation, and control as can be promptly undertaken by the United States by virtue of its power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce and promote the general welfare, and by reason of its proprietary interest in the public domain, and to the States, municipalities, communities, corporations, and individuals such portion as properly belongs to their jurisdiction, rights, and interests, and with a view to properly apportioning the costs and benefits, and with a view to so uniting the plans and works of the United States within its jurisdiction, and of the States and municipalities, respectively, within their jurisdictions, and of corporations, communities, and individuals within their respective powers and rights, as to secure the highest development and utilization of the waterways and water resources of the United States.

The board may receive and use any funds or property donated or subscribed to it or in any way provided for cooperative work, but no moneys shall be expended under any arrangement for cooperation until the funds to be provided by all parties to such arrangement shall have been made available for disbursement.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF INDEPENDENT INITIATIVE AND CONSTRUCTION.

SEC. 4. That all things done under this act shall be done with a view not only to constructive cooperation, as herein provided, but also with the definite and specific object of enlarging the field of accomplishment contemplated by the act through promoting and encouraging independent initiative and construction by States, municipalities, districts, and other local agencies and organizations, and creating object lessons and building models and making demonstrations that will have that effect and influence and induce such supplemental and independent action and construction.

CONFERENCE AND COOPERATION OF BUREAUS AND STATES.

SEC. 5. That it shall be the duty of said board to coordinate and bring into conference and cooperation the various scientific and constructive bureaus of the United States with each other and with the representatives of States, municipalities, public and quasi-public corporations, towns, counties, districts, communities, and associations, and of foreign nations on international streams, in the carrying out and accomplishment of all the provisions, purposes, and objects of this act.

The board shall have authority to call upon and to bring into cooperation any other Federal department or bureau whose investigations or assistance may be found necessary to the carrying out of the provisions of this act, and the board is hereby authorized to defray the expenses of such investigations or assistance through a transfer of so much of its appropriation as may be necessary to the Federal department or bureau thus brought into cooperation.

CORRELATION, COORDINATION, AND ADMINISTRATIVE ECONOMY.

SEC. 6. That the board shall harmonize and unify and bring into correlation and coordination the investigations made, and information, data, and facts collected and obtained by the various bureaus or offices of the Government relating to or connected with the matters and subjects referred to and the questions involved in this act, and to print, publish, and disseminate the same, and it shall exercise such general supervision as may be necessary to provide against duplication or unnecessary, inadequate, unrelated, or incomplete work in connection therewith, and shall make such recommendations to the waterways commission as it may deem advisable at any time for the accomplish-

ment of that end or in the interest of harmonious cooperation, efficiency, and economy in carrying out the purposes of this act. The special function of the board at all times shall be to promote the adoption of the best and most approved methods and systems of investigation, administration, construction, and operation in carrying out such specific improvements, works, and projects as are authorized by this act, or which may be from time to time authorized by Congress, if within the scope of the work of the said board as herein set forth; and it shall further be the special function of the board to effect the largest possible saving as the result of the unification, correlation, and coordination of the work of the various bureaus in the investigations and administrative and constructive work provided for in this act in accordance with existing law or with such provisions as Congress shall from time to time impose.

REPORTS, PLANS AND ESTIMATES BY THE BOARD.

SEC. 7. That the functions of the board shall be to obtain full information through its members concerning all proposed expenditures provided for within the scope of this act. Each bureau or service chief member shall report to the board the work proposed by the bureau or organization which he represents, and shall present full plans and estimates covering such proposed construction or action. The findings and conclusions of the board and plans adopted by it for construction and action shall be binding upon the members thereof in so far as may be consistent with existing laws.

REFERENCES TO AND INSTRUCTIONS FROM THE PRESIDENT.

SEC. 8. That all matters involving apparent conflict with departmental authority, jurisdiction, or procedure, or as to which the board may desire suggestions or advice, shall be laid before the President, who may thereupon call into conference the waterways commission, and after consideration of such matters by the commission, suitable instructions shall be issued by the President to heads of departments, with a view to securing unity of action along the lines approved by the President and the commission.

EXECUTION OF PLANS AND WORK BY THE SEVERAL BUREAUS.

SEC. 9. That in the execution of all plans and duties intrusted or delegated to the several bureaus the respective chiefs thereof, acting under departmental regulations and procedure, shall execute the work according to the methods prescribed by law, the functions of the board of river regulation being those of a consulting and advisory body, with power to make recommendations to the President and the waterways commission, and through the President to the heads of departments, with a view to effective coordination and cooperation as to all things proposed by this act, and to carry out such work as Congress shall from time to time prescribe or has prescribed in this act.

COMPREHENSIVE PLANS FOR RIVER REGULATION.

SEC. 10. That the board of river regulation shall develop, formulate, prepare, consider, and determine upon comprehensive plans for the conservation, use, and development of the water and forest resources of the United States in such manner as will best regulate the flow of rivers and their tributaries and source streams, and the stage of water in inland waterways, and the confinement of all rivers and waterways at all times within fixed and established channels, and embracing, with that object, the construction of levees and revetments and all works necessary for the fixation of channels and flood protection, drainage, and the reclamation of swamp and overflow lands; water storage in natural and artificial reservoirs; the beneficial use of waters for irrigation and for all domestic, municipal, and industrial purposes; the maintenance and development of underground water supplies and the storage of water in the ground and in irrigated lands and underground reservoirs; the enlargement of the areas and raising of the levels of the ground waters; the construction of flood-water canals, by-passes, and restraining dams; the control and regulation of drainage and the replenishment of streams by return seepage; the perpetuation of forests and maintenance of woodland cover as sources of stream flow; the prevention of denudation and erosion; the protection of channels and harbors from eroded soil materials; the clarification of streams; the utilization of water power; the prevention of the pollution of streams and rivers; the sanitary disposal of sewage and purification of water supplies; the best distribution of forests, woodlands, and other growth, and of cultivated and irrigated areas in their relation to river flow; the protection of forested and woodland areas from destruction by fire or insects; the reforestation of denuded areas; the planting of forests and establishment of forest plantations; the preservation and planting of woodlands and any other growth and protective cover on watersheds; the increase and development of the porosity and absorbent qualities and storage capacity of the soil upon which rain or snow may fall; the making and furnishing of plans for flood-water storage and other works for irrigation and power for farms, towns, and villages; the acquisition, subdivision, and settlement in small, intensively cultivated farms of lands for water storage by irrigation; the building of the irrigation systems for such lands, including reservoirs, dams, canals, ditches, and all necessary works; the protection of farms, villages, towns, and municipalities from damage by freshets and overflow; and the impounding of flood waters in artificial lakes and storage reservoirs to prevent floods and overflows, erosion of river banks, and breaks in levees, and to regulate the flow of streams and reinforce such flow during drought and low-water periods, the ultimate object of all such work being to regulate and, so far as possible, standardize the flow of rivers and their tributaries and source streams, and in the accomplishment of that object to induce and secure the cooperation of States, municipalities, districts, counties, towns, and other local agencies and organizations.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

SEC. 11. That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution to give especial attention to the acquisition from foreign countries and from all sources of all obtainable knowledge concerning the problems involved in the work of the board and to diffuse and disseminate the same, and to establish and maintain a museum of water and forest resources in which such knowledge shall be placed before the people, with object lessons illustrating the disastrous consequences that have resulted from the neglect of such conservation and particularly the failure to conserve the forest and water resources in other countries of the world, and to utilize the resources of the institution under his charge, which may be available for that purpose, to aid in the education of the public in the elements of knowledge which lead to the successful regulation of water and of the flow of rivers and the use of water in connection with agriculture and the intensive cultivation of land, and in connection with all other industries.

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY.

SEC. 12. That it shall be the duty of the Chief of the Bureau of Plant Industry to collate and bring together for the information of the

board the results of all investigations with reference to soil and the production of crops through the use of water as a fertilizer and stimulant to plant growth, and of the relation of water in excess or deficiency to successful crop production. He shall recommend for the consideration of the board such further investigations as may properly be conducted in connection with the purposes for which the board is created and which shall lead to the largest and most valuable results being obtained through the use of water in connection with successful plant growth and increased crop production, and the establishment of a national system for the information of the people in the intensive cultivation of small tracts of land, with a view to increasing food production and thereby reducing the cost of living and encouraging suburban and rural settlement and homemaking, and the beneficial use of water in connection therewith as an ultimate influence for river regulation in aid of interstate commerce.

FOREST SERVICE.

SEC. 13. That it shall be the duty of the Forester of the Department of Agriculture to present to the board all essential facts bearing upon the relation of forests to the various problems under consideration and the value and importance of forests and woodland and other growth and their proper control and extension and protection from fire; also such facts as may be essential to the proper enlargement of forested areas for the protection of watersheds and the maintenance of the flow of rivers during the low-water season and the prevention of denudation and erosion, with consequent silting up of waterways and harbors, and to prepare and present to the board comprehensive plans for the protection of the forests from fire and other destructive agencies.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

SEC. 14. That it shall be the duty of the Director of the Geological Survey to recommend to the board appropriate surveys and examinations, and upon proper approval cause to be executed topographic surveys of each drainage basin, these being planned with reference to the work contemplated by the board and the immediate demands and needs of the board. Such surveys shall include and show, in addition to the topography, the character of all lands embraced therein, and it shall be his duty to classify the same and designate the best use to which said lands may be devoted in carrying out the provisions of this act. The topographic maps shall be of such scale as will bring out the existence of feasible storage or reservoir sites. He shall make such additional surveys of specific localities as may be required by the constructing engineers, and in such surveys he shall establish monuments based on geodetic horizontal and vertical control. The surveys shall be of such nature as to provide adequate bases for geologic investigation and engineering works. He shall also cause measurements to be made of the flow of streams at such places as may be designated by the board as yielding results of largest importance in the discussion of the problems in hand and the execution of proposed engineering works, and shall carry on such studies in river pollution and purification, in water-power possibilities, and other stream investigations as the board may designate. It shall be his further duty to examine all forested lands or lands intended to be afforested or reforested which it is proposed to purchase under this act, and to report whether the control and use of such lands will influence the preservation of water supplies or stream flow or tend to regulate the flow of navigable rivers on whose watersheds they are located.

RECLAMATION SERVICE.

SEC. 15. That it shall be the duty of the Director of the Reclamation Service to bring before the board the results attained in the construction of works of irrigation and reclamation throughout the arid and semiarid regions of the United States, and the application of the experience thus obtained to the conditions existing in the more humid sections of the United States. He shall extend the surveys and investigations and construction of irrigation works such as are authorized in the act of June 17, 1902, known as the reclamation act, throughout the United States and including reclamation of land by drainage as well as by irrigation: *Provided, however,* That no part of the fund created by the act of June 17, 1902, shall be expended for this purpose. Such further investigations and construction and operations in States and Territories other than those covered by the original act above referred to and amendments thereto shall be made in accordance with such rules and regulations as shall be established by the Secretary of the Interior, and shall be subject to such of the terms, provisions, and requirements of said reclamation act as the Secretary of the Interior shall determine are to be made applicable thereto, but shall be at the expense of the river regulation fund created by this act, and expenditures from said last-mentioned fund may be similarly made in any State or Territory. He shall construct, operate, and maintain, until otherwise provided by law, such irrigation and drainage works and systems as the board may determine are needed for the regulation of the streams and rivers and the improvement of agricultural conditions, or for the proper control, disposition, and utilization of sewage or other waste waters which without such regulation would pollute the streams or injuriously affect the health or prosperity of the community. He shall also present to the board proposed plans for cooperation with irrigation or drainage projects or enterprises constructed, initiated, or contemplated by States, districts, municipalities, corporations, associations, or individuals, and shall negotiate agreements for coordinating and making more useful works already in existence or proposed through their incorporation into more effective systems.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS, UNITED STATES ARMY.

SEC. 16. That the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army shall present to the board all proposed plans for works proposed to be built under this act which the waterways commission shall determine are to be built under his supervision, including plans for levees, dikes, revetments, dams, canals, cut-offs, spillways, controlled outlets, flood-water channels, and wasteways, bank-protective and channel-fixation works, reservoirs or basins for the storage of flood waters for flood prevention and river control, or works for which examinations and surveys have been made by or with the cooperation of States, municipalities, or districts, and which it is sought to have constructed under this act, together with such facts and data as may be required for the construction of such works, or any of them, for the regulation of the flow of rivers. He shall also construct, operate, and maintain such levees, flood-protection, channel-fixation, and bank-protective works as are built in accordance with this act and also such reservoirs as are so built for the storage of water to control and regulate the flow of rivers, and to reinforce such flow in seasons of low water and to prevent floods and protect lands and communities from overflow as may be determined by the waterways commission: *Provided, however,* That the provisions of this section shall be so administered as in no way to supersede or conflict with any specific provisions which Congress shall from time to time make by way of appropriations other than

such as are made by this act for work and improvements to be performed or maintained by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, but that all work prescribed under this section shall be supplemental to and coordinated with the work as specifically prescribed by Congress in other acts.

DUTIES OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE APPOINTED BY THE PRESIDENT.

SEC. 17. That it shall be the duty of the members of the board of river regulation appointed by the President and constituting the executive committee of the board of river regulation, as hereinbefore provided, under the direction of the chairman of the board to consider, prepare, and present to the board comprehensive plans providing for the best utilization of the water resources of the United States in connection with river regulation, flood prevention and protection, and the increase of the flow of rivers in low-water seasons and the maintenance at all times of a navigable stage of water in the waterways of the United States, and providing also for the coordination of and cooperation between rail and water routes of transportation, and the establishment, maintenance, and protection of terminals and transfer sites and facilities for transshipment between rail and water routes, and to adjust all the plans contemplated for the projects constructed under this act to the ultimate purpose of regulating and standardizing the flow of the rivers and inland waterways of the United States, in aid of interstate commerce as aforesaid; and further to give expert advice to the board in its consideration of details, problems, and projects; and it shall be their special duty to constantly promote and stimulate harmonious and effective cooperation between the different bureaus and services of the National Government and between the Nation and States, municipalities, and other local agencies in working out constructive plans under this act; and it shall further be their duty to examine and study the plans presented to the board for consideration, with the view of promoting the fullest possible measure of efficiency and economy in administration and construction, and avoiding all duplication in the work of the respective bureaus.

EQUITABLE APPORTIONMENT AMONG WATERWAY SYSTEMS.

SEC. 18. That in carrying out the provisions of this act regard must be had, as far as practicable, to the equitable apportionment and contemporaneous execution of the works and projects contemplated under this act among the several waterway systems of the United States.

Not less than \$10,000,000 annually for 10 years shall be apportioned to the Appalachian and Atlantic region, including the territory within the drainage basins of all rivers flowing into the Mississippi River below the Ohio River or into the Gulf of Mexico east of the Mississippi River or into the Atlantic Ocean.

Not less than \$10,000,000 annually for 10 years shall be apportioned to the drainage basin of the Ohio River.

Not less than \$5,000,000 annually for 10 years shall be apportioned to the drainage basin of the Mississippi River above St. Louis and the territory included in the drainage basins of the rivers draining into Canada or into the Great Lakes or into the Mississippi River from the east between East St. Louis and Cairo, Ill.

Not less than \$10,000,000 annually for 10 years shall be apportioned to the Mississippi River from St. Louis to the Gulf of Mexico, and the territory lying between the Atchafalaya River, the Mississippi River, and the Gulf of Mexico, and including the Atchafalaya River as a flood water outlet for the Mississippi River, and including the controlling works necessary for such use of said Atchafalaya River, and all levees and bank protective works, cut-offs, and auxiliary flood-water channels necessary to control and prevent all overflows from said Atchafalaya River which shall, in this respect, be regarded as in the same class with the Mississippi River and entitled to the same recognition in the matter of levee construction and flood protection for adjacent territory as the main Mississippi River.

Not less than \$10,000,000 annually for 10 years shall be apportioned to the territory included in the drainage basins of the Missouri River and other rivers, bayous, and waterways flowing into the Mississippi River from the west below St. Louis or flowing or debouching directly or through connecting waterways into the Gulf of Mexico west of the Atchafalaya River.

Not less than \$5,000,000 annually for 10 years shall be apportioned to the territory including the drainage basin of the Colorado River, and extending on the west to the crest of the watersheds draining into the Pacific Ocean, and on the north to the drainage basin of the Columbia and Snake Rivers; not less than \$5,000,000 annually for 10 years to the drainage basins of the rivers flowing through or into the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys or into the Pacific Ocean in California; and not less than \$5,000,000 annually for 10 years to the drainage basins of the Columbia and Snake Rivers and other rivers flowing into the Pacific Ocean in Oregon and Washington.

The drainage basin of every river above mentioned shall be understood to include all the tributaries and source streams of such rivers.

REPLENISHMENT OF RIVER REGULATION FUND BY BOND ISSUE.

SEC. 19. That the President is authorized, whenever the current revenues are insufficient to provide the \$60,000,000 annually appropriated for the river regulation fund, to make up the deficiency in such fund by the issue and sale of United States bonds, bearing interest at a rate not exceeding 3 per cent per annum, payable semiannually, and running for a period not exceeding 30 years.

APPROPRIATIONS AND APPORTIONMENT.

SEC. 20. That the moneys hereby annually appropriated in section 1 of this act shall, subject to all the provisions of this act, be apportioned and expended by the services and bureaus herein named in carrying out the purposes and provisions of this act and under the direction of the heads of the respective departments and in accordance with existing laws and regulations or such modifications thereof as may be made from time to time in accordance with the general system or systems proposed by the board and approved by the waterways commission in the following sums annually, which shall be available until expended for the following purposes:

For the Smithsonian Institution, for obtaining information and material relating to the subjects covered by this act in the United States and foreign countries, and publishing and distributing the same to the people of the United States, and for the establishment and maintenance of a museum of water and forest resources, and for any other purposes mentioned or referred to in section 11 of this act, \$1,000,000.

For the Bureau of Plant Industry, for the increase and development of the porosity and absorbent qualities and storage capacity of the soil upon which rain or snow may fall in order that its run-off may be in that way checked and the water absorbed into the earth, and to that end for the establishment and maintenance of garden schools and dem-

onstration garden farms, and instruction in intensive cultivation and the use of water for irrigation therein and in rural industrial communities, and for investigations and instruction with reference to terracing and methods of cultivation adapted to preventing erosion on hill-side slopes, and with reference to the use of water as a fertilizer and stimulant to plant growth in all ways, and the adoption of all methods of agriculture that will increase the porosity and absorbent qualities of the soil and check surface wash or erosion or sudden run-off and thereby tend to prevent the formation of floods, and for the acquisition of lands that may be required for such purposes, and for any other purposes mentioned or referred to in section 12 of this act, \$6,000,000.

For the Geological Survey, for topographic surveys and the measurement of streams and other hydrographic and hydrologic works, and for the examination of lands intended to be purchased under this act, and for any other things required by the board to be done in connection with any investigation or construction done under this act, \$3,000,000.

For the Reclamation Service, for the reclamation of lands by either irrigation or drainage, or both, and for the building of irrigation and drainage systems to aid in the regulation or equalization of the flow of rivers and their tributaries and source streams through the conservation, utilization, and ground storage of waters in irrigated or drained lands, and for the acquisition and improvement by irrigation or drainage of specific tracts of land for intensive cultivation and settlement, and for the building of canals and ditches, and carrying to completion any and all methods of utilizing water for irrigation as a means for water conservation or river regulation, and for any other purpose mentioned or referred to in section 15 of this act, \$20,000,000.

For the Forest Service, (a) for the protection from fire and insect infestation of national forests, where such protection is essential to the preservation and maintenance of water supplies, and for the acquisition of lands within or near existing national forests or other lands which are necessary to the adequate protection of water supplies, and for building the necessary roads, trails, fire lines, fire-protection stations, telephone lines, and for any and all other things required for such fire protection, including the fighting of fires and the employment of forest guards and rangers, \$3,000,000.

(b) For the protection from fire of the forested watersheds of all rivers and streams, and for the organization and maintenance of a system of fire protection on any private or State forest lands situated upon the watersheds of such rivers or streams, in cooperation with any State or group of States, in the manner provided for in an act entitled "An act to enable any State to cooperate with any other State or States, or with the United States, for the protection of the watersheds of navigable streams and to appoint a commission for the acquisition of lands for the purpose of conserving the navigability of rivers," known as the Appalachian National Forest act, and also in direct cooperation with cities, counties, towns, villages, and other owners of woodlands and forested areas on watersheds, and wherever essential to the preservation of water supplies and for the protection of such forested watersheds and areas from insect infestation, \$1,000,000.

(c) For the protection, perpetuation, enlargement, maintenance, regulation, and control of water supplies by the establishment and maintenance of forest nurseries, the planting or replanting of forests, the reforestation of denuded areas, the carrying out of silvicultural improvements in the national forests, and the establishment and maintenance of forest plantations and parks and the acquisition of lands therefor to provide instruction in the planting and care of trees and forests for the purpose of awakening and maintaining a local interest in and knowledge of the relation of forests to the preservation of water supplies and stream flow, \$1,000,000.

(d) For the acquisition of forest lands by and through the National Forest Reservation Commission as and in the manner provided for in the Appalachian National Forest act above referred to, subject to all the conditions and requirements contained in said act, \$5,000,000.

Provided, That the provisions of the said Appalachian National Forest act shall, after the expiration thereof by limitation, still continue and be in force with reference to all moneys made available for expenditure thereunder by this act, either for fire protection or for the acquisition of forest lands.

For the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for building bank protective works to prevent erosion and cutting of the banks and consequent caving, and to control the river and hold it in a permanently fixed and established channel, and for building and maintaining levees, revetments, dikes, walls, embankments, gates, wasteways, by-passes, cut-offs, spillways, controlled outlets, drainage canals, flood-water canals, and channels, weir dams, sill dams, restraining dams, impounding basins, and bank-protective works for river regulation, and, as a means to that end, the building of works for reclamation, drainage, and flood protection, and for building reservoirs and artificial lakes and basins for the storage of flood waters to prevent and protect against floods and overflows, erosion of river banks, and breaks in levees, and to regulate the flow of source streams, rivers, and waterways, and re-enforce such flow during drought and low-water periods, and for the operation and maintenance of the same, \$20,000,000.

By Mr. GRONNA:

A bill (S. 2740) relating to additional entries on lands subject to entry under the enlarged homestead act; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey:

A bill (S. 2741) making it unlawful for individuals, corporations, or associations to employ armed men or bodies of armed men on their premises for any purpose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 2742) granting an increase of pension to George H. Barmby (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2743) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Taylor (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2744) granting an increase of pension to Henrietta M. Clark (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2745) granting an increase of pension to Catharine H. Warner (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2746) granting an increase of pension to Annie L. Larkin (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2747) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Whiting (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2748) granting an increase of pension to Purleyette M. Burnett (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2749) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Wilcox (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2750) granting an increase of pension to Harriet B. Swift (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maine:

A bill (S. 2751) granting a pension to Harriet E. Vose; and

A bill (S. 2752) granting a pension to Bridget Fahey (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

A bill (S. 2753) granting an increase of pension to David Rosebraugh; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2754) for the relief of James Baird; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PAGE:

A bill (S. 2755) for the relief of George H. Hunting (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRANDEGEE:

A bill (S. 2756) to repeal section 20 of the act entitled "An act to amend the national banking laws," approved May 30, 1908.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. In connection with the bill I beg leave to state that its object is to have a bill pending which possibly may be taken advantage of in case a reform can not be made at this session in the banking and currency laws of the country. I desire to call attention to the fact that section 20 of the act approved May 30, 1908, known as the Aldrich-Vreeland emergency currency bill, provides as follows:

That this act shall expire by limitation on the 30th day of June, 1914.

In case no currency bill should be passed at the present session of Congress, I shall make an effort to have that section repealed, so that if any money stringency develops it may be relieved as provided by law.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENTS TO THE TARIFF BILL.

Mr. SMOOT. I submit an amendment in the nature of a substitute for Schedule K—wool and manufactures of wool—of House bill 3321—the tariff bill—which I ask be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BRADLEY submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

CAUCUS ACTION ON THE TARIFF.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I ask unanimous consent to publish in the RECORD extracts from a press dispatch concerning the action of the Democratic caucus on the tariff, including my personal comment.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not hear the Senator.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Will the Senator repeat his suggestion? We could not hear him on this side.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I ask leave to insert in the RECORD a brief statement which I made regarding the action of the caucus on the tariff.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I could not hear what the statement was about.

Mr. NEWLANDS. It is a brief statement which was published in the newspapers regarding the caucus action on the tariff.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. SMOOT. Is it the request that it be printed in the RECORD?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. The statement was not delivered here, of course?

Mr. NEWLANDS. No.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SIMMONS. I beg pardon of the Senator from Nevada, but I did not hear his request.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I ask leave to print in the RECORD a brief statement which was published in the press, including comment made by myself, regarding the caucus action on the tariff.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLAIM 49 VOTES FOR THE TARIFF BILL IN SENATE—CAUCUS OF DEMOCRATIC SENATORS FAILS TO PASS BINDING RESOLUTION, MANY MEMBERS BEING OPPOSED—STATEMENT OF NEWLANDS.

WASHINGTON, July 7.

Forty-seven Democratic Senators stood up in the party caucus, one by one, late to-day and declared their intention to vote for the Underwood-Simmons tariff revision bill as finally approved by the caucus a few minutes previously. Two Senators, RANDELL and THORNTON, of Louisiana, stated that they would not make such promise because of the proposal to place sugar on the free list in 1916. Senators HIRCHCOCK, of Nebraska, and CULBERSON, of Texas, were absent, but both are known to be in favor of the bill. This gives the Democrats 49 votes for the bill, or a slender majority of 1, with the vote of the Vice President to fall back on in an emergency. An absolutely binding resolution was not adopted, the poll by individuals being substituted, and that poll was put only on the ground of personal promise and was not made binding. A resolution was adopted, however, declaring the Underwood-Simmons bill a party measure, and urging its undivided support without amendment, unless such should be submitted by the committee. Senator NEWLANDS, of Nevada, cast the only vote against this resolution, but Senators SHAFROTH, of Colorado, RANDELL, and THORNTON did not vote.

TEXT OF RESOLUTION.

The resolution was as follows:

"Resolved, That the tariff bill agreed to by this conference in its amended form is declared to be a party measure, and we urge its undivided support as a duty by Democratic Senators without amendment: *Provided, however,* That the conference of the Finance Committee may, after reference or otherwise, propose amendments to the bill."

STATEMENT BY NEWLANDS.

Senator KERN made public the resolution and a statement regarding the roll call. Senator NEWLANDS, in a statement explaining his position, gave evidence of his intention to stand by the party.

"I voted against making the bill a party measure," Senator NEWLANDS said, "because, while it is superior to the existing tariff, it has certain defects which should be remedied. It discriminates against far western products. The reductions should be apportioned over a period of three years instead of taking effect immediately. Further reductions on a sliding scale should be provided for, particularly on food products and clothing. There should be a tariff board with power to ascertain facts, make recommendations to Congress, and make further reductions under a rule established by Congress."

"Whilst our duties on sugar and wool should be materially reduced, we should not take the risk, by precipitate action, of readjusting injuriously the sugar industry in our insular possessions or of checking the beet-sugar development or the wool industry of the far West. Such action is likely to make us dependent upon foreign countries and ultimately raise the price of both sugar and wool."

WOULD NOT BE BOUND.

"I am opposed to the binding obligation of a caucus, and so voted; but I believe in party responsibility, and while I have protested against going too far in some directions and not going far enough in others, I can foresee no contingency which will separate me from my party associates in legislative action. I trust that during the coming period of protracted debate, the Democrats will in conference improve the bill in the particulars referred to, and I shall use every effort in that direction."

Before final action on the bill the caucus gave concessions to the Senators from woolgrowing States by adopting an amendment making effective a provision for free raw wool on December 1, 1913, and the rates on manufactures of wool January 1, 1914. Earlier in the day the Finance Committee had voted to recommend the dates as October 1 and December 1, respectively, but the caucus voted for the further delay.

This action completed the revision of the Underwood bill, which has occupied the Finance Committee majority and the caucus since May 7.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION LAW.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I ask to have printed as a public document (S. Doc. No. 131) an address delivered by the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] at the third annual convention of the International Association of Casualty and Surety Underwriters on the economic value and social justice of a compulsory and exclusive workmen's compensation law. I will state that it discusses quite exhaustively the substance of a bill that is now before the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. In connection with the address, and as a public document (S. Doc. No. 132), I ask to have printed some statistics on the subject prepared by Mr. Wills, who is the assistant grand chief engineer of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers. The statistics cover the whole subject.

Mr. SMOOT. Is it short?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It is very short.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to make an inquiry of the Senator from Oregon. I did not hear what is the subject of the statistics.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The workings under a compensation law substantially as the bill now pending in the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. Statistics prepared by whom?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. By Mr. H. E. Wills, of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

Mr. ROOT. I wish to ask the Senator from Oregon whether in the matter which he proposes to print there is included a copy of the bill now pending in the Senate?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. No.

Mr. ROOT. I think it would be very useful to have a copy of the bill printed with the address of the Senator from Utah. I trust that that may be done.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. With the remarks of the Senator from Utah?

Mr. ROOT. That a copy of the pending bill be printed, together with the address of the Senator from Utah and the statistics.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I myself think it would be a good plan. I ask the Senator from Utah for his opinion.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The remarks which the Senator from Oregon has asked to have printed are addressed to the general subject of workmen's compensation. They do not deal specifically with the bill. The remarks deal specifically with the question of the law being made compulsory and exclusive in character. The statistics to which the Senator calls attention were prepared by Mr. Wills under this very bill.

Mr. ROOT. That is what I supposed.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. In connection with the statistics it might be very well to print the bill.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Then I ask that the bill the Senator from New York speaks of may be printed along with the statistics furnished by Mr. Wills.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It will be very well to print the bill in connection with the figures.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and that action will be taken.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on Monday, July 21, at the termination of the routine morning business, I shall expect to address the Senate on the pending tariff bill.

RETIRED OFFICERS OF THE ARMY.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I find on the desk a letter from the Secretary of War in response to a resolution of the Senate of May 1 asking for the employment of retired Army officers. I remember when the resolution was offered, the purpose being, it was alleged, to ascertain whether Army officers resigned and went into the employment of corporations who are doing business with the Government.

The report as it appears gives the Senate no information except as to the number of Army officers who are employed, and states nothing as to what their employment is or what their compensation is. I think it is practically of no value. If the resolution was worth considering at all, we ought to have had information that would enable us to determine whether or not these retired officers are engaged in business that is questionable as to its propriety.

It seems to me that when an officer is retired and subject to orders from the Government the Secretary of War ought to know where he is and what he is doing, and that is what Congress wanted to know. We are providing money every year for these retired Army officers under the assumption that they are incapable of earning a living after they leave the Army. I should like to know personally whether these men are now employed in a capacity that enables them to earn large returns for corporations because of their former connection with the Government. That was the object of the resolution. It has not been accomplished apparently.

PRINTING OF TARIFF BILL.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives, which was read and referred to the Committee on Printing:

House concurrent resolution 11.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 30,000 copies of the bill H. R. 3321, with amendments, as reported in the Senate July 11, 1913, 20,000 copies for the use of the House and 10,000 copies for the use of the Senate.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I gave notice at the last meeting that this morning after the close of the morning business I would discuss one feature of the tariff bill, and with the consent of the Senate, on account of the necessity of my absence for a short while, I desire to ask the privilege of going on at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from North Dakota will proceed.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I will preface my remarks by a table which I have prepared, showing a comparison of the proposed rates of duty on agricultural products with the present law, giving the rate under the tariff act of 1909, the rate of this proposed bill, and the per cent of decrease. A glance at this

table will show that practically every article or product of any importance coming from the hands of a northern farmer is placed upon the free list.

I will ask that the table be printed as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed, as follows:

Comparison of proposed rates of duty on agricultural products with the present law.

Article.	Rate tariff act 1909.	Rate proposed bill.	Decrease.
			<i>Per cent.</i>
Cattle.....	27½ per cent.....	Free.....	100
Swine.....	\$1.50 head.....	do.....	100
Sheep.....	do.....	do.....	100
Horses and mules.....	25 per cent.....	10 per cent.....	60
All other animals.....	20 per cent.....	do.....	50
Barley.....	30 cents per bushel.....	15 cents per bushel.....	50
Barley malt.....	45 cents per bushel.....	25 cents per bushel.....	45
Buckwheat.....	15 cents per bushel.....	Free.....	100
Corn.....	do.....	do.....	100
Oats.....	do.....	6 cents per bushel.....	60
Rye.....	10 cents per bushel.....	Free.....	100
Wheat.....	25 cents per bushel.....	do.....	100
Wheat flour.....	25 per cent.....	do.....	100
Rice, cleaned.....	2 cents per pound.....	1 cent per pound.....	50
Rice, uncleaned.....	1½ cents per pound.....	¾ cent per pound.....	50
Butter.....	6 cents per pound.....	2½ cents per pound.....	60
Cheese.....	do.....	do.....	60
Milk.....	2 cents per gallon.....	Free.....	100
Cream.....	5 cents per gallon.....	do.....	100
Beans.....	45 cents per bushel.....	25 cents per bushel.....	45
Eggs.....	5 cents per dozen.....	Free.....	100
Hay.....	\$4 per ton.....	\$2 per ton.....	50
Onions.....	40 cents per bushel.....	20 cents per bushel.....	50
Peas.....	25 cents per bushel.....	10 cents per bushel.....	60
Potatoes.....	do.....	Free, with proviso.....	100
Straw.....	\$1.50 per ton.....	50 cents per ton.....	66
Vegetables.....	25 per cent.....	15 per cent.....	40
Apples, peaches, pears, etc.....	25 cents per bushel.....	10 cents per bushel.....	60
Lemons.....	1½ cents per pound.....	¾ cent per pound.....	66
Oranges, etc.....	1 cent per pound.....	do.....	50
Bacon and hams.....	4 cents per pound.....	Free.....	100
Fresh beef, veal, etc.....	½ cent per pound.....	do.....	100
Poultry, live.....	3 cents per pound.....	1 cent per pound.....	66
Poultry, dead.....	5 cents per pound.....	2 cents per pound.....	60
Lard.....	1½ cents per pound.....	Free.....	100
Tallow.....	½ cent per pound.....	do.....	100
Flax straw.....	\$5 per ton.....	do.....	100
Flax, not hackled.....	1 cent per pound.....	do.....	100
Flax, hackled.....	do.....	do.....	100
Tow of flax.....	\$20 per ton.....	do.....	100
Hemp, and tow of hemp.....	\$22.50 per ton.....	do.....	100
Flaxseed.....	25 cents per bushel.....	15 cents per bushel.....	40

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, for more than two months, behind carefully guarded doors and shaded windows, the Democratic members of the Finance Committee have been hatching a tariff measure. They have tenderly shielded it from the too chilling blasts of cold reason and from the too dazzling light of information.

Finally, this unnatural, incubated thing has been brought forth. It has been exhibited to the majority side of the Senate. That majority has viewed it for some time curiously rather than critically, has been unable to say what it is, and by a unanimous vote has determined to take no chance with its conscience in attempting to find out.

It seems to have been conceived in animosity against every American industry that really needed protection—the many small concerns of the country, the only competitors of the great concerns that need no legislative favors. While it bears the birthmark of ill will against nearly all, the special object of its choler and hate is the American farmer. It is especially endowed with tooth and talon for his injury and destruction.

Before that incubating committee he seems to have had no friend. Every hand was raised against him, and with a malevolence devoid of one single element of mercy this monster, cloaked under the deceptive name of a tariff-reform measure, is to be turned loose to prey on his vitals. But though he has been condemned without a hearing by your committee, he will not be friendless in this Chamber nor slaughtered without as earnest a defense as I am able to make for him.

DEMOCRATIC PARTY VERSUS AMERICAN FARMER.

And so I shall address myself first to you, the Democratic Party, with reference to your assault upon the American farmer. In this year 1913 you are about to commit a greater crime against the American farmer than has ever been perpetrated by any political party against any class of people during any period of recorded history. You are about to rob him of sacred rights which he has paid for through long years of toil, self-denial, and patient waiting. With violent hands you are about to strip him of every advantage which the changed conditions of home supply and demand were about to yield him.

You have declared that he is an outcast in the land which he has made, the only one of all the classes of American people who is not entitled to any consideration at your hands. You have insulted his sense of fairness, slapped him in the face, and kicked him into the gutter.

I may not ultimately save him, but I am going to lift him out of this gutter and place him upon the plane of his inherent rights for a moment, and allow him to face you and compel you to face him, and then I am going to put a few questions to you for him.

My first question is, What crime has the American farmer committed against the Democratic Party that has awakened in the heart of that party this dire vengeance against him? Is it because of his past political affiliation that you are heaping upon him the vengeance for all your previous defeats? Or do you consider yourself to be the instrument through which Providence is to work its punishment because in the last political campaign he forgot the faith of his fathers and went chasing after a strange god, with cloven hoofs and branching antlers? If he is to be punished for this heresy, are you the proper person to inflict the punishment? You, at least, who have benefited by his action and hold the power you now enjoy through it, ought to be the last one to strike the blow.

Many of his kind trusted you, voted for you, allowed themselves to be deceived by you. They knew they were not rich, and you always claimed you were the poor man's friend. I am not denying your claim that you like the poor man, for I well know that your political policies have made more poor men in this country than any other policy under the sun.

But you are the beneficiary of the farmer's infidelity to his own party last fall. And for you to now be his executioner for the offense of being misled by you strikes me as being one of the most cold-blooded propositions I have ever heard of.

You told him on the stump that he had been greatly wronged by President Taft, because that President sought to trade off his protection for reciprocal tariff reductions by Canada, and you said that showed the Republican Party was not to be trusted, but that you could be trusted to take care of his interest, and you are proceeding to take care of it in this bill.

The reciprocity proposition had at least the one virtue that it proposed to get something for surrendering something. You, on the other hand, trade away the farmer's interest in everything for absolutely nothing. The reciprocity proposition subjected the farmer to the free competition of Canada only. You subject him to the competition of the whole world—all of Canada, Australia, Venezuela, Argentina, Cuba, the Philippines, and every other country on the face of the earth that may want to dump its products into a market that belongs of right to the American farmer.

You had him in the slough of depression during all of your last administration, from 1893 to 1897. You saw him working himself out of that mire and just beginning to reach a degree of prosperity to which he was justly entitled. You behold the farmer by close frugality and economy just getting his head and shoulders out of the muck of this depression, out of the everlasting debts and into the sunshine of prosperity, and it seems to afflict you with a fit of madness, and with the swift and deadly stroke of your tariff bludgeon you strike him down.

If your assault upon the farmer were the result of impulsive brain storm or uncontrollable frenzy, you might ask the usual verdict in such cases; but his innocence of and freedom from responsibility for either the high cost of living or the cost of high living of which you and the rest of the population are complaining are so clearly established that you can not fail to know it. You admit that your bill will injure him, and you say you intend to do so. You say he is receiving too much for his products, and you intend to compel him to sell them cheaper. By no system of logic can any of you escape that charge. If, as some of you declare, the present tariff protection does not enhance the value of the farmer's products, then you know that taking it off will not diminish the price of farm products, and you know that your claim that you are going to benefit the consumer is false and demagogic in the extreme. Not only this, but you know, if you have given the subject the slightest consideration, that the removal of protection on his products will injure him without benefiting in any degree the ultimate consumer.

RIGHT TO EQUAL CONSIDERATION.

Let me ask you another question: Is not the American farmer equal in intelligence to the American stonecutter, bricklayer, carpenter, or plasterer? Are not his rights to favorable legislation equal to the rights of these other laborers? You enact laws that this plasterer shall in no case be allowed to labor more than 8 hours in a day, and you will punish anyone who

will allow him to work 8½ hours. Do you favor legislation that will allow the farmer sufficient profit in his business that he and his sons can make a living on an 8-hour labor basis? Not by any means. You want to keep down the price the farmer receives for his products. You want to compel him to continue to work 16 hours a day for an average of one-fourth of what the bricklayer receives for his work of 8 hours. You know that the farmer has to work 16 hours a day, that his wife and children have to labor 16 hours a day, and that all they get for it is their board and clothing; and now you propose to reduce his earnings so that he will have to cut down on the clothing, and you say that he must do this so that your 8-hour-a-day plasterer can get cheaper meat, flour, and potatoes. Why do you not say to the laborer, "You must reduce your wages and work longer hours so that the farmer can buy cheaper clothing"? Your answer is: Labor is organized into a great federation, the head of which appears before our committees, tells us what organized labor demands, sits in our galleries, and checks our votes, and we are truly afraid of him. The farmer is not organized; his interests are so scattered and the character of his products so diversified that he has been unable to organize a great national political society, and so you are not much afraid of him. Then, too, you say you may be able to fool him with the claim that protection does not protect him. Well, you may yourselves get fooled in that. The last administration tried that idea in the reciprocity pact, and it got its answer, and you will get yours the first opportunity he has to give it to you.

Your bricklayer receives from 60 to 80 cents per hour. Your farmer does not earn that much on the average for a whole day. If he and his family should receive 10 cents per hour for each hour of hard labor which they perform, he would be twice as prosperous as he is to-day. You know as well as I do that the good wife of the farmer, who labors from 6 a. m. to 10 p. m., does not receive for that service one-half of what your colored woman cook receives, and she gets no Wednesday and Sunday afternoons off.

But admitting this, you say: "The farmer lives more frugally than the laborer of the city. He has not as expensive habits. He does not dress as well. His opportunities to spend money for the little extravagances of life are not so great. He does not smoke 10-cent cigars; it is a pipe or nothing."

Mr. President, I want to protest right here with all the earnestness in my power against the assumption which seems to prevail everywhere that the tiller of the soil is not expected to live on a plane of equality with the average person engaged in city vocations, that he is not expected to clothe himself or his family with equally expensive fabrics. Why on earth should the farmer be forced to be more frugal or more economical than those who live within the confines of a city? The line that marks the boundary between city and country limits is not a line of demarcation between either human intelligence or human rights. Does the Democratic majority of the Senate concur in the sentiment that seems everywhere prevalent among city people, that the Almighty never intended that the tiller of the soil should have more than a mere existence, that his purpose in the world is simply to produce food for others to eat, for which economic arrangement he is to be accorded the right to live in a humble way—a honey bee to be hived and tolerated that drones may have honey to live on?

In all lines of business outside of farming the laborer must receive his wages. Neither frost, hail, blight, nor bug can affect him. The farmer, on the other hand, will lose at least a full crop once in 10 years, and will have many half crops during that period. Everyone acquainted with farm earnings and income knows that the labor of the farmer has always been the poorest paid labor in the United States; that the thing which the farmer sells always has represented and still represents twice as much expended energy in its production as the thing which he buys with it; that measured by the amount of labor expended in producing them, food products as they leave the farmer's hands always have been and are to-day cheaper than any other products in the world; that it takes less expended energy on the part of even the poorest priced laborer in the city to buy a loaf of bread than it does of the farmer to produce the wheat that makes that loaf of bread. Why, then, do you want to further discriminate against the farmer?

Thousands of farmers in my State last year lost half of their crop because of their inability to get labor to care for it. They were unable to get the labor because the prices for that labor in the city are so much higher than the farmer can afford to pay and the hours so much shorter than on the farm that the laborer can not be induced to go to the farm. If you could have seen the frantic efforts of farmers to save their crops, which meant their year's labor, before the winter was on, offering as high as four or five dollars a day for labor, you

would appreciate more than I think you do the wrong you are doing them when you by legislation further reduce the price of their products for the benefit of the ultimate consumer.

I present these comparisons, Mr. President, between the labor in the country and the city that I may bring to your attention the rank injustice you are doing to a class that are already discriminated against by your laws. At the present price of farm land, with the present price of farm labor, if the farmer had to hire all his work done, there is not one of them who could make the produce of the farm pay for the labor expended.

Here is a table of cost of operating a farm where all the work is done by hired labor. It was furnished me by a farmer who has for years been a close student of agricultural economics. I think he has allowed \$50 per month to the farmer as manager and overseer and \$20 per month to his wife in the computation which I present:

Cost of production of wheat on a farm of 640 acres in North Dakota.	
VALUE OF FARM, MACHINERY, AND HORSES.	
Cost of farm, 640 acres, at \$50 per acre.....	\$32,000.00
Cost of farm implements.....	1,616.00
Farm horses.....	2,400.00
Total investment.....	36,016.00
EXPENSES.	
Seed grain, labor.....	5,831.00
Interest on investment at 6 per cent.....	2,160.96
Taxes and depreciation in value of implements and horses.....	460.08
Total expenses.....	8,452.04
PROCEEDS.	
8,320 bushels of wheat, at 90 cents per bushel.....	7,488.00
Loss to farmer.....	964.04

Observe, at 90 cents per bushel this farmer is \$964 in debt at the end of the year. How would he balance at the end of the year with wheat selling at 60 and 65 cents per bushel, as it was selling for last fall? In this table he has made no allowance for loss of crop by hail or drought or any partial loss; no allowance for depreciation of soil qualities. I am myself the owner of some farming land that I am unable to work at all because the cost of labor would be greater than the proceeds of the crop.

The farmer does live. He does not ordinarily run behind, as indicated in this table. Why? Because the table is based upon an assumption that he is to receive wages and that his wife is to receive wages. He is denied the hundreds of little luxuries that the ordinary man of the city avocations indulges in, and he is able to exist.

FARMER VERSUS BUSINESS MAN.

I notice, Mr. President, that whenever you try to arrive at what is reasonable compensation for the manufacturer you start in with capital invested in his business, the interest he has to pay on this capital as a charge against him. Then you compute all his labor and taxes and overhead charges. Against this you estimate the value of all he produces, and you then strike a balance, and you say he should have a reasonable profit above this expense. You even allow for the bonded indebtedness, which is often the full value of the property. Why not treat the farmer the same way?

A farm ought to pay interest on the investment and, in addition, a reasonable profit, after paying for all the labor used on it. But, Mr. President, there is not a grain farm in the United States that will do it.

LEGISLATION AGAINST FARMING INTEREST.

You say it is a crime to make one man's business profitable at the expense of another, and yet, with that cry reverberating throughout the country by legislating shorter hours in city employment we have necessarily legislated against the farmer's interest. The American farmer is both an employer and an employee. He not only manages his own business, but he performs the labor in that business. If he hires laborers outside of his family to till the soil, he and his boys work side by side with those laborers. And if the laborer whom he employs is from the city and objects to doing a farmer's day's work, he and his sons continue to labor several hours after this city gentleman has quit.

By legislation limiting the hours of labor in city employment, while leaving the farm laborer to cope with whatever farm conditions require, you say to this laborer: "Leave the farm; do not you see the farmer is trying to make you do just as much work as he himself does? Go back to the city. We will not allow your employer there to treat you so. If he even requests you to work 8 hours and 3 minutes we will punish him." The farmer says to you: "Why are you driving my laborers from my field? You know I can not run my farm and make a living on an 8-hour system, and you know I can

not lure men away from an 8-hour system into a 14 or 16 hour system without raising the hire to a point where I can not afford to use it. I am making no complaint against your 8-hour custom in the cities. If the health and happiness of the people are better for the shortened hours and the Saturday half-holiday, I shall make no complaint on the ground that the conditions of agricultural life are such and the profit of agricultural avocations are so meager that I can not be included within the short-hour system. But if your city laborer drops his working tools at 4 o'clock in the afternoon while I am compelled to labor on in the hot sun for four hours longer and in the twilight and darkness for another two hours; if, after he is resting or visiting all of Saturday afternoon, I must still put in every hour of that day; if I am compelled to pay a greater price for the things I purchase because of a diminished supply due to decreased hours of labor; if I, the laborer on the farm, must so toil and suffer for the benefit of the city laborer and for the benefit of city avocations, for Heaven's sake do not further discriminate against me. The very least you can say to me is: 'Here is our American market, and so long as we discriminate against you in the matter of labor we will at least give you first chance in that market.'"

But your ears are closed to every appeal for justice for the tiller of the soil. You are reaching a point where your income is unable to keep pace with your extravagances, and you are asking the farmer to make good the deficit by reducing the price of his products. It never occurs to you that the proper place to begin economy is on the luxuries, the unnecessary of life. You declare to him that the American people are paying \$1,500,000,000 a year for meat, and you say that is too much. He answers, "They are also paying \$2,000,000,000 a year for liquors. Cut your liquor bill half and you will save enough to buy all your meat." You declare they are paying \$435,000,000 a year for flour. He replies, "They are paying \$800,000,000 for tobacco. Cut your tobacco bill half and your flour is free." You declare they are paying \$225,000,000 a year for potatoes. He replies, "They are paying \$500,000,000 for theaters and amusements. Cut your amusements half and your potatoes are free." You declare they are paying \$300,000,000 a year for butter and eggs. He replies, "They are spending \$500,000,000 a year for confectionery." His replies are unanswerable. They are so many monuments reading in clear black letters into your eyes an indictment of your own criminal extravagances and high living.

Then he puts some questions directly to you: At the highest value I have received for my products during the last 10 years, the most prosperous in American history, and placing my labor on a par with the lowest paid labor in the city, has there ever been a day when it did not require more labor on my part to produce the wheat for a loaf of bread than on the part of the purchaser of that loaf to pay for it; more labor on my part to produce a bushel of potatoes than on the part of that laborer to purchase it; more labor to produce a pound of meat than on the part of the laborer to pay for it? To each of these questions—and there are many other questions directed specifically toward his products—you are compelled to answer: No; there has never been such a time. Then, if there has never been such a time, upon what principle of justice are you asking me to further reduce the price of my products and further add to the enormous disadvantage under which I am now laboring? You are compelled to answer, It is upon no principle of justice we are doing this. It is an injustice, induced by political exigencies. Less than one-third of the people of the United States are engaged in agricultural pursuits. The other two-thirds want cheaper food. We have promised to make food cheaper for them, and two-thirds have a greater voting power than one-third. You have just got to suffer for the cause of democracy, that is all.

FARMERS' AND CONSUMERS' PRICES.

Mr. President, injuring one man for the benefit of another is bad enough, but inflicting upon him an injury without any corresponding benefit to anyone else makes that which before was bad now criminal. If the ultimate consumer of farm products were to receive any real, substantial benefit, you might have a grain of excuse for your legislation against the farmer. But he will get no benefit whatever. If prices to the ultimate consumer go down, it will be because of general stagnation in business which always depresses prices, and not because you have compelled the farmer to reduce his prices to the lowest of the world's prices.

With a tariff of 25 cents a bushel on wheat the American price during the past 10 years has averaged from 10 to 12 cents a bushel above the Canadian price at corresponding markets. In other words, the Canadian exporter has paid about half of the tariff, the American miller the other half, and the American

farmer has received a benefit in the increased value of his wheat crop of from 10 to 12 cents per bushel. You now propose to take away that benefit. You will, of course, injure him, but will you thereby help the ultimate consumer?

Mr. President, a reduction of 10 cents a bushel on wheat will have no influence whatever upon the retail price of flour. The reduction bears such a small ratio to the value of a barrel of flour that it scarcely affects the wholesale price at all and is entirely lost sight of in the retail trade. The price of wheat fluctuates from day to day, and from month to month there is often a variation all the way from 10 to 15 cents per bushel, while the wholesale price of flour will remain stationary. There is never any change in the retail price until there has been a great and decisive change in the price of grain and the higher or the lower price of grain has become to a degree permanent.

But suppose that by a 25 cents per bushel tariff on wheat the farmer does get 10 cents a bushel better price for his wheat, as has been demonstrated in the last 10 years. And suppose that this extra price of 10 cents a bushel is charged up to the ultimate consumer. The ultimate consumer uses about a barrel of flour per capita a year. That would increase the cost of a barrel of flour and make an added expense of 45 cents a year—32 cents a month. The ultimate consumer man would have to retrench in his expenses to meet this extra outlay to the extent of two-thirds of a 5-cent cigar a month. The ultimate consumer girl would have to retrench in her expenses 3 sticks of chewing gum per month. What an enormous burden this tax is upon the people who smoke and chew gum from 4 o'clock on, while the farmer is sweating in the field and worrying over reports of frost, hot winds, hail, noxious weeds, smut, chinch bugs, and grasshoppers.

But you say the people want cheaper bread. You know this reduction will not reduce the price of a loaf of bread a penny. What the people want is not cheaper bread but a better opportunity to earn good wages to buy that bread, and your proposed tariff measure will decrease that opportunity.

Very little bread is to-day made at home in the cities. The cost of fuel to bake it scarcely justifies the expense of home-made bread. Would a reduction of 10 cents a bushel on wheat affect the retail cost of your bread? Let us see: In 1894 and 1895, when the farmer in my State was receiving from 35 to 40 cents a bushel for his wheat, you were paying 5 cents for a loaf of bread made from that wheat. In 1910, when the farmer in my State was receiving a dollar a bushel for his wheat, you still paid the same nickel for your loaf of bread. If an advance of over 50 cents a bushel, an increase of 100 per cent, on wheat has not raised the price of your bread, how do you expect to reduce it by reducing the price of wheat to the extent of 10 cents a bushel by taking away the farmer's protection? Wherein will your ultimate consumer be benefited? The 10 cents per bushel has not injured and will not injure the ultimate consumer of flour and bread, but it may make all the difference in the world to the overworked, underpaid farmer. It may make the difference between a meager profit and a heavy loss. The only persons who will be benefited by cheaper wheat are the comparatively few middle men and millers.

How about barley? During the last 20 years the range in prices of barley in this country has been from 30 cents to \$1 per bushel. But the retail price of beer has not varied a penny during all that time. Who, then, will be benefited by this great loss to the farmer by reason of forcing him to compete with the vast fields of Canada in barley production? The only persons who will be benefited by a 50 per cent tariff reduction on barley will be the few manufacturers of barley products and the brewers. And why this deep interest in the brewing industry? Why has the Democratic Party entered into this alliance with the brewers against the farmers? Are not practically all of the brewers of the country now classed among the millionaires and multimillionaires? Is there any reason for increasing the vast and almost boundless estates of Anheuser, Busch, Blatz, Pabst, Hellman, and Hamm at the expense of the raisers of barley? The ultimate consumer has never suffered because of the prices received by the farmer. Why, then, this studied effort on the part of this Democratic majority to put practically everything the farmer produces on a free-trade basis? What I have said of wheat and barley will apply with equal force to every other grain and meat product.

SHEEP AND WOOL.

Again you say you will benefit the ultimate consumer by compelling the farmer to sell his wool and his sheep for less than he has been receiving. Has he been receiving more than he should that you seek to strike down his industry? The producer of sheep and wool comes within the rule which I have already declared that, measured by the time and labor expended in their production, there is nothing on earth produced by labor that

is so cheap as farm products. Why, then, do you want to reduce the prices received by the farmer for his wool? By free wool and free mutton for a time you will undoubtedly reduce the price of sheep and wool to the packer and the wool dealer. And it may be that with free mutton you may slightly reduce the cost of mutton to the consumer for a while. You will reduce it until every herd of sheep in the United States, except the few which may range on Government land or over cheap lands of the arid and semiarid regions, is annihilated. And after you have practically destroyed the sheep industry of the country, what then? Will not the price of mutton go up? Of course if it goes up it will not help out the farmer, as he will not then have sheep to sell. But will you not then be at the mercy of the importer of mutton? Not only will you destroy your home industry and deprive the farmer of a much-needed profit but you will send millions of dollars out of the country to buy mutton and wool; money that ought to be kept within the country.

Mr. President, you will not reduce the cost of a suit of clothes a penny because of a reduction in the cost of wool. The cost of a suit of clothes may be reduced under your Democratic administration, but it will not be because of your reduction in the price of wool paid to the farmer, but because of the general stagnation of business brought about by your tariff bill. Business stagnation is a most potent factor in depressing values and cost of all commodities. It makes, however, mighty little difference to the public how cheap a thing is if it has not the money to buy it.

Mr. President, prices will be lower in the future. Prices demanded for any commodity must adjust themselves to the ability of the public to pay. Any material reduction or even a threatened material reduction in the protection afforded American products is bound to cause a degree of stagnation which will always show itself in lower market quotations. With this threatened revision you have already produced this condition, and without waiting for your bill to become operative prices of most commodities have already gone down. The farmers have already lost millions in the values of all their products. The present low prices of cereals is not due wholly to an abundant crop. Eggs and butter have been since last fall on the average much lower than they have been for many years. I can find no evidence of oversupply of these products. Certainly the hens have not suddenly become more prolific and increased their supply to meet the exigencies of a Democratic administration. The flow of the cow's milk will not increase to meet the stress of the added hunger of Democratic times. The subtle power by which the waves all know and feel the approach of sun or moon does not indicate to hen or cow the approach of a Democratic tariff bill. But human remembrance, recalling past experience, has learned to hedge and economize at its approach with the alacrity with which a man who has experienced one cyclone rushes to the cellar at the approach of another.

In theory the wool producer under our present tariff has been receiving a protection of 11 cents per pound on his wool. In practice he has actually received a benefit of from 7 to 9 cents. That 7 to 9 cents above the world's level of prices is sufficient to justify him in raising sheep in this country. It is sufficient to maintain the industry in this country, and even if it were charged to the ultimate consumer, which it is not, it would not be worth taking into consideration. There is in an ordinary suit of clothes costing from \$25 to \$30 custom-made, and from \$30 to \$65 tailor-made, about 4 pounds of wool, at 8 cents per pound; that suit of clothes would be impressed with 32 cents for wool protection—such a mere fraction of the retail price that it is not taken into account. Do any of you for a moment believe that after removing the farmer's protection on wool a suit of clothes which now costs \$30 can be bought for \$29.68? And if it could, is it worth while to destroy a great industry to save 32 cents on a suit of clothes?

DOES PROTECTION PROTECT?

Mr. President, one of the inherent weaknesses of our human mind is that a rule or conclusion founded on fact and reason, as they once existed, will persist long after both the fact and the reason have disappeared. And so unto this day we still hear people talking about the prices of our grain being fixed by the Liverpool price, because they probably were at one time governed in some degree by Liverpool quotations. They have not been influenced by the Liverpool prices for nearly half a century. Liverpool being a great market for wheat drawn from all sections of the world, its quotations may properly be taken as representing the world's general level of prices plus freight, insurance, and middlemen's profits. When we stop to think we know that the price of any commodity is governed by the demand in the field of greatest consumption. And if six-sevenths of all the wheat raised in the United States

is consumed in the United States, it necessarily follows that its price is governed by the home demand rather than the foreign demand. It is true, of course, that world's supply and world's demand affecting what may be called the world's level of prices necessarily affects the American local price, but it never governs it. It can be properly said that the Liverpool price does govern the Canadian price of wheat, because the great bulk of that wheat must find its market there. That is the place of greatest consumption, so far as Canada is concerned. With free trade with Canada the great Canadian surplus of the northwestern Provinces would flow into this country until our prices were level with the Canadian prices or the world's general level. To show how little the price of grain at Liverpool affects the same kind of grain in the United States I will here insert a table showing the range of prices in Minneapolis and Liverpool by months for the years 1908, 1909, 1910, 1911, and 1912:

Range of cash prices per bushel of No. 1 northern.

Month.	Minneapolis.	Liverpool.
1908.		
January.....	\$1.05-\$1.14	\$1.27-\$1.32
February.....	1.01-1.10	1.19-1.26
March.....	1.03-1.11	1.18-1.29
April.....	.98-1.08	1.21-1.26
May.....	1.06-1.11	1.25-1.28
June.....	1.05-1.10	1.19-1.22
July.....	1.07-1.21	1.19-1.21
August.....	.99-1.25	1.26
September.....	1.00-1.05	1.25-1.27
October.....	1.02-1.05	1.18-1.22
November.....	1.04-1.08	1.18-1.20
December.....	1.06-1.12	1.17-1.20
Average of high and low prices.....	1.07	1.23
1909.		
January.....	1.07-1.11	1.19-1.20
February.....	1.10-1.16	1.22-1.27
March.....	1.12-1.17	1.27-1.31
April.....	1.18-1.29	1.32-1.41
May.....	1.27-1.35	1.38-1.41
June.....	1.29-1.38	1.38-1.39
July.....	1.23-1.35	
August.....	.97-1.44	1.32-1.32
September.....	.97-1.01	1.30-1.32
October.....	.99-1.06	1.16-1.19
November.....	1.01-1.07	1.17-1.20
December.....	1.05-1.15	1.19-1.21
Average of high and low prices.....	1.15	1.27
1910.		
January.....	1.10-1.16	1.22-1.24
February.....	1.10-1.16	1.20-1.23
March.....	1.12-1.16	1.19-1.22
April.....	1.06-1.16	1.18-1.23
May.....	1.03-1.14	1.00-1.14
June.....	1.02-1.17	1.02-1.10
July.....	1.13-1.29	1.10-1.27
August.....	1.09-1.23	1.21-1.25
September.....	1.09-1.15	1.19-1.24
October.....	1.02-1.12	1.14-1.16
November.....	.99-1.07	1.07-1.11
December.....	1.00-1.06	1.07-1.09
Average of high and low prices.....	1.10	1.16
1911.		
January.....	1.01-1.10	1.10-1.12
February.....	.95-1.04	1.11-1.13
March.....	.92-1.00	1.06-1.11
April.....	.91-1.01	1.07-1.09
May.....	.96-1.02	1.08-1.09
June.....	.93-1.00	1.08-1.09

Range of cash prices per bushel of No. 1 northern—Continued.

Month.	Minneapolis.	Liverpool.
1911.		
July.....	\$0.95-\$1.02	(1)
August.....	1.01-1.09	\$1.14-\$1.15
September.....	1.02-1.11	(1)
October.....	1.05-1.12	(1)
November.....	1.01-1.06	(1)
December.....	.98-1.06	(1)
Average of high and low prices.....	1.01	1.10
1912.		
January.....	1.05-1.09	1.23-1.24
February.....	1.03-1.08	1.26-1.27
March.....	1.06-1.09	(1)
April.....	1.05-1.16	(1)
May.....	1.13-1.18	(1)
June.....	1.11-1.15	(1)
July.....	1.03-1.12	(1)
August.....	.90-1.08	(1)
September.....	.85-.91	1.24-1.25
October.....	.86-.92	1.20-1.21
November.....	.80-.88	1.10-1.16
December.....	.80-.84	1.09-1.13
Average of high and low prices.....	1.00	1.19

¹ No quotation.

The transportation between Minneapolis and Liverpool, including insurance, handling, commissions, profits to exporters, and so forth, is from 21 to 23 cents per bushel. Therefore, if Liverpool governed the prices in Minneapolis, it should always be at least that much higher than the Minneapolis prices. A glance at the table will show an average of 16 cents difference in 1908, a difference of 12 cents in 1909, 6 cents in 1910, 18 cents in 1911, and 19 cents in 1912.

Comparing Winnipeg with Liverpool, we will find that the average price in Winnipeg during 1909 was 1.09, in Liverpool, 1.27; in Winnipeg in 1910, 0.99, in Liverpool, 1.16; in Winnipeg in 1911, 0.95, in Liverpool, 1.09; in Winnipeg in 1912, 0.92, in Liverpool, 1.19. It must be remembered right here that the Winnipeg price is the price quoted for Fort William and Port Arthur, which have the same rate of transportation as Duluth and a little cheaper than Minneapolis. It will thus be observed that the difference between Winnipeg and Liverpool approximately measures the freight, profit for handling, insurance, commissions, and so forth.

Comparing the prices between Winnipeg and Minneapolis for the years 1909, 1910, 1911, and 1912 we will find as follows: The average price in Winnipeg in 1909 was 1.09, in Minneapolis, 1.15; in 1910 in Winnipeg, 0.99, in Minneapolis, 1.10; in 1911 in Winnipeg, 0.95, in Minneapolis, 1.01; in 1912 in Winnipeg, 0.92, in Minneapolis, 1.00.

To arrive at the actual benefit the farmers of Minnesota, the Dakotas, Montana, and all that northwestern section are receiving, I have another table which will show the comparative prices of wheat and barley in the United States at contiguous points along the line. It must be remembered that under the bonding privileges any of this grain on the Canadian side can be shipped through the United States to the point of export for the same freight rates as are charged on the American side. Therefore, if the tariff protection should be taken away, our prices could not be any higher than those on the Canadian side, and at the prices on the Canadian side, on account of the enormous surplus due to the opening up of northwestern Canada—a surplus large enough to glut the American market—we would immediately go down to the world's level of prices. The following is the table:

Comparative prices of wheat and barley in United States and Canada.

Dates.	Kind of grain.	Name of town in United States.	Price per bushel.	Name of town in Canada.	Price per bushel.	Difference in price.	Distance apart.	Tariff per bushel.
Dec. 31, 1910.	Wheat.	Kermif.	\$0.90	Estevan.	\$0.76	\$0.14	15 miles apart.	\$0.25
Jan. 10, 1911.	do.	Pembina.	.97	Emerson.	.82	.15	4 miles apart.	.25
Do.	do.	Neché.	.96	Gretna.	.81	.15	2 miles apart.	.25
Dec. 31, 1910.	do.	Portal.	.90	North Portal.	.75	.15	Just across the line.	.25
Jan. 11, 1911.	do.	Walhalla.	.96	Haskett.	.83	.13	6 miles apart.	.25
Dec. 31, 1910.	do.	St. John.	.91	Boissevan.	.81	.10	15 miles apart.	.25
Do.	do.	Hanna.	.90	Snowflake.	.77	.13	4 miles apart.	.25
Do.	do.	Neché.	.91	Gretna.	.81	.10	2 miles apart.	.25
Do.	do.	Sarles.	.89	Clearwater.	.75	.14	Just across the line.	.25
Jan. 10, 1911.	do.	Westhope.	1.00	Colter.	.85	.15	15 miles apart.	.25
Do.	do.	do.	1.00	Lyleton.	.84	.16	20 miles apart.	.25
Do.	do.	do.	1.00	Malita.	.86	.14	30 miles apart.	.25
Do.	do.	St. John.	.96	Boissevan.	.86	.10	15 miles apart.	.25
Do.	do.	Hansboro.	.90	Cartwright.	.77	.13	8 miles apart.	.25
Dec. 31, 1910.	do.	Antler.	.91	Lyleton.	.78	.13	5 miles apart.	.25
Jan. 10, 1911.	do.	Portal.	.92	Boscovis.	.75	.17	15 miles apart.	.25
Do.	Barley.	Pembina.	.67	Emerson.	.42	.25	4 miles apart.	.30
Do.	do.	Neché.	.66	Gretna.	.38	.28	2 miles apart.	.30
Do.	do.	St. John.	.66					

This table I prepared for the debate on the reciprocity pact in January, 1911, which accounts for the fact that the last date given is January 10, 1911. On April 2, 1912, I again wrote to ascertain the prices of grain at these contiguous points, and in reply I received the quotation of prices on the 6th of April on wheat, barley, and flax. Here are the prices paid for wheat at these points on that day:

UNITED STATES.	Cents.
Pembina.....	95
Neche.....	95
Walhalla.....	94
Hanna.....	93
Salles.....	95
Hansboro.....	94
St. John.....	95
Westhope.....	95
Antler.....	93½
Sherwood.....	93½
Portal.....	91
Kermit.....	91
CANADA.	
Emerson.....	86
Gretna.....	86
Haskett.....	86
Snowflake.....	78
Crystal City.....	82
Cartwright.....	87
Bannetman.....	89
Coulter.....	88
Lyleton.....	84
Carrievale.....	84
North Portal.....	85
Estevan.....	80

The spread between the Canadian and American markets at these contiguous points measures the tariff benefit to the United States. Do any of you suppose for a moment that if the wheat buyer could purchase grain at Snowflake for 78 cents per bushel he would be paying 93 cents per bushel at Hanna, just 4 miles distant on the same road, with exactly the same freight rates?

These tables which I have given showing the marked advantages of the American over the Canadian market can not be explained away on any possible hypothesis other than that of protection accorded under our present tariff law. For more than a dozen years we have not been exporting any of the standard northwestern grain at all. We have been exporting some macaroni and possibly some low-grade grain.

EFFECT OF RECIPROCITY AGITATION.

Two years ago we had before us the reciprocity pact with Canada. It was before the Senate about eight months before it was passed. We who live in the Northwest could not but note how prices of grain of all kinds sagged or advanced according as the news was favorable or unfavorable to the adoption of that treaty. We read in the papers the daily reports giving the rise or decline in our products. The report of February 11, 1911, from the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce, published in the Minneapolis Journal, says:

The bottom broke out of the wheat market late this week, and prices suffered the worst decline in several months. Early prices registered moderate declines, and this was followed by a moderate reaction. Both May and July closed Saturday below the dollar mark. This severe break was caused principally by the developments favorable to the adoption of reciprocity with Canada.

Mark the words, "This severe break was caused principally by the developments favorable to the adoption of reciprocity with Canada." The grain buyers knew what that reciprocity pact meant. They knew that the annual output of wheat in that northwestern section of Canada contiguous to Minneapolis was normally about 195,000,000 bushels; that there is enough land which could be put into wheat, all ready for the plow, in that section of the country to raise 3,000,000,000 bushels, nearly enough to supply the entire world market. Of course, it is not put into wheat now because the prices will not justify it. But if prices would justify turning over that new, fertile prairie, seeding it to wheat, that section of Canada west of the Red River of the North could to-day supply enough wheat to feed the world.

There was nothing in sight to materially depress our prices, and the moment the reports went out from Washington that the reciprocity treaty was liable to be adopted the bottom dropped out of our prices.

Again, the same report says:

On Friday and Saturday prices suffered the sharpest break in several weeks. May sold down to 98½ cents, the lowest prices for this contract since August, 1900. The near month fluctuated in a range of 4½ cents for the week, and the same contract in Chicago showed a difference of 5½ cents. It was thought that reciprocity with Canada would have a more depressing effect on the price of Minneapolis wheat than Chicago because of the geographic situation. The price fluctuations of this week seemed to confirm this theory.

Why did the depressing effect of favorable action upon reciprocity concern Minneapolis more than Chicago? It was because the Canadian wheat is within the Minneapolis territory.

Minneapolis is its natural market. It would glut the Minneapolis market before any of it would go into the Chicago market.

Again, the same publication says:

European countries are being offered wheat at prices that would not be profitable for Americans to export. The decline of this week has put the United States nearer an export basis, but still further declines will be necessary to allow this country to enter the European market with any profit.

Why should the Democratic Party wish to force the farmers of the Northwest upon an export basis? Why strike their prices down to the level of the Canadian prices? Why do we thus seek to benefit Canada at the expense of our people? The Canadians do not support our schools; they do not build our roads; they do not pay the heavy taxes in the United States for the special benefits we receive.

EFFECT OF RECIPROCITY AGITATION ON BARLEY.

How did the prospect of Canadian reciprocity affect our barley prices?

Berger Crittenden Co., commission men, speaking of barley in the early part of their report in February, 1911, say:

The market was dull as ever, with only a few cars of Wisconsin sold. Outside of this a few cars of Minnesota were sold, whereas all the other cars carried over for the last three or four days were again carried over to-day, malsters and brewers still holding back. We naturally have to await developments.

On February 9, 1911, barley was sold at 49 cents in Winnipeg; cheap grades in Minneapolis and Duluth, 84 cents; Chicago and Milwaukee, 86 cents. With that difference between Winnipeg, Minneapolis, Duluth, and Milwaukee is it any wonder that the malsters and brewers were awaiting the fate of the reciprocity agreement?

We then came nearly to the close of the session of Congress. It was apparent that the Canadian reciprocity agreement could not at least be passed during that Congress. What was the effect? Here is another article printed in the Minneapolis Journal in its report on the grain exchange the day after Congress adjourned:

Wheat prices soared up to the heights to-day that the market has not seen in over two weeks. The advantage in the near month of 23 and 2½ cents was the biggest upward daily jump wheat has taken in months. The adjournment of the United States Senate without acting on the McCall bill was the cause of the sharp advance. The market declined 15½ cents, largely on the prospects that the reciprocity treaty might be adopted.

Do you comprehend what that 15 cents per bushel means to the farmer?

The three States, Minnesota and the two Dakotas, raise, say, about 200,000,000 bushels of wheat a year. Fifteen cents a bushel means \$30,000,000 upon that wheat crop alone. Let me ask the Democratic Party, is it not worth while to save this \$30,000,000 to the American farmers? Is not he worth that to the country? Is it not far better that he should get a decent living out of his farm, even though you pay 50 cents a year more for your flour? But before the end of the year wheat prices, which had soared up in anticipation that the reciprocity pact might be killed, had to go down again. We passed the law, and grain prices waited on the lowest rung of the ladder for Canada's action. Canada voted on it and turned down our offer. We offered to give her something for something. She declined it, and the next day after her decision the price of wheat went up 6 cents a bushel, and continued to go up thereafter. She refused to accept our offer to take all of her wheat free of tax for a little benefit to our manufactures. Naturally we would think that a party imbued with a national pride would scarcely have renewed this offer within a year; but the Democratic Party, representing the United States to-day, in a most servile spirit says to Canada: Inasmuch as you turned down our offer of something for something, we will make you a present of everything for nothing, we will injure our own farmers to the greatest possible extent, and we will not ask anything in return. Just send your wheat over here, glut our markets, destroy the prosperity of our farmers, not that the Democratic Party loves you more, but that it loves our farmers less. This sudden conversion of the Democratic Party to Christian philosophy is certainly marvelous. But in its zeal, not through love but seeming hate, it has gone far beyond the scriptural doctrine. It has not only turned the country's other cheek to be smitten by Canada but has tied its hands and turned its whole face for a knockout blow.

THE AMERICAN BREWER AND THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

Mr. President, those who will read over the fiscal history of our country for 40 years will not be surprised at the coalition of the Democratic Party and the American brewing association against the American farmer. Their last tariff act reduced the duty on barley from 30 cents a bushel to an ad valorem duty, amounting to from 10 to 12 cents per bushel. When the Repub-

lian Party came into power in 1897 it destroyed the coalition, gave the farmer again his proper protection and an honest price for his barley. I here present a table showing the rate of duty, quantity imported, value, duty collected, and so forth, for the years 1894 to 1912:

Barley.

Fiscal year ended June 30—	Rate of duty.	Quantity.	Value.	Duty collected.	Average.	
					Value per unit of quantity.	Ad valorem rate of duty.
		<i>Bushels.</i>				<i>Per ct.</i>
1894....	30 cents per bushel....	862,083	\$392,078	\$258,625	\$0.45	65.96
1895....	do.....	80	35	24	.44	68.56
1896....	30 per cent.....	2,074,076	\$51,717	255,515	.41	30.00
1896....	do.....	826,017	312,224	93,667	.378	30.00
1897....	do.....	1,254,968	388,259	116,477	.31	30.00
1898....	do.....	10,220	3,194	958	.312	30.00
1898....	30 cents per bushel....	104,298	37,590	31,289	.36	83.24
1899....	do.....	110,320	53,699	33,096	.487	61.63
1900....	do.....	161,613	78,257	48,484	.484	62.00
1901....	do.....	178,320	87,468	53,496	.49	61.21
1902....	do.....	57,414	33,250	17,224	.579	51.80
1903....	do.....	59,523	28,567	17,857	.48	62.51
1904....	do.....	88,254	44,997	26,476	.501	58.84
1905....	do.....	79,182	38,566	23,754	.487	61.59
1906....	do.....	19,930	10,825	5,979	.543	55.23
1906....	do.....	11,815	6,608	3,544	.559	53.64
1907....	do.....	181,607	133,627	54,482	.735	40.16
1908....	do.....	2,671	1,471	801	.551	54.47
1909....	do.....	3,989	2,650	1,196	.664	45.00
1910....	do.....	186,246	98,794	55,874	.83	56.56
1911....	do.....	2,768,474	1,929,214	\$30,542	.696	43.05

At the end of the fiscal year 1894, while the tariff was 30 cents a bushel on barley, it was worth 45 cents a bushel even under the close times and generally dull markets and prices of all products. In 1894 we changed the tariff to 30 per cent ad valorem, which amounted to from 10 to 12 cents a bushel, and we soon brought the price of barley down from 45 to 30 cents a bushel, or a loss of 15 cents a bushel—33½ per cent. Then we raised the tariff again in 1897 to 30 cents a bushel, and barley again steadily advanced in price and continued to do so until 1908, when it was 73 cents a bushel. The large crop of 1909 brought it down to 55 cents a bushel, and the short crop of 1910 sent it up again to 86 and 96 cents, and in some instances even a dollar a bushel. For the fiscal year when the duty was 30 per cent ad valorem, amounting to 10 or 12 cents a bushel, we imported 2,000,000 bushels. Afterwards, when we made the tariff 30 cents a bushel, the importations dropped down to 104,000 bushels.

The best way to know whether our prices are the higher and the extent of the benefit which we derive from protection to farm products is to compare the prices at adjacent points on the Canadian and American line, and here again I will insert a table of prices paid for barley at such points on April 6, 1912:

UNITED STATES.		Cents.
Pembina.....		90
Neche.....		90
Walthalla.....		90
Hannah.....		89
Sarles.....		84
Hansboro.....		80
St. John.....		80
Westhope.....		88
Antler.....		80
Sherwood.....		88
Portal.....		87
Kermit.....		87
CANADA.		
Emerson.....		60
Gretna.....		50
Haskett.....		51
Snowflake.....		45
Crystal City.....		56½
Cartwright.....		58
Bannerman.....		54
Coulter.....		58
Lyleton.....		50
Carrievale.....		49
North Portal.....		62
Estevan.....		45

Portal is a little town on the border, with a street for the border line. On one side floats the British flag and on the other floats the American flag. One is called Portal and the other is called North Portal, but they are practically the same town.

It will be observed from the above table that on the 6th day of April, 1912, our prices ranged all along the line just about 30 cents a bushel higher than the Canadian prices—just the amount of the tariff. Do not you know that under free trade our prices will drop to the Canadian level? Do not you know that if the brewer can get Canadian barley at Gretna for 60

cents he is not going to pay 90 cents a bushel for that barley at Neche, just 2 miles away and on the same road?

No; Mr. President, no Senator need attempt to salve his conscience by voting away every shred of the farmer's protection by trying to convince himself that the farmer gets no real protection. He might as well try to hypnotize himself into the belief that 2 and 2 make 3. The actual prices received show with mathematical accuracy just to what extent he is benefited by protection.

DEMOCRATIC PARTY AND FLAX GROWER.

The farmers of my State raise about half the flaxseed raised in the United States. The other half is raised principally in Minnesota and South Dakota. We are often compelled to raise flax or nothing on our land. An early fall of snow or early freezing may prevent fall plowing, a late or wet spring delay the spring plowing, until no other crop can be planted and matured, and so we put the land into oats and flax. It is a difficult and uncertain crop to raise. We need a very good price to get any profit out of it. With a protection of 25 cents per bushel we have generally received the full benefit of that protection.

Here again is a table showing prices received April 6, 1912, at adjacent points along the Canadian border by the American and the Canadian farmer:

UNITED STATES.		
Pembina.....		\$1.98
Neche.....		1.98
Walthalla.....		1.97
Hannah.....		1.94
Sarles.....		1.96
Hansboro.....		1.95
St. John.....		2.02
Westhope.....		1.98
Antler.....		1.95
Sherwood.....		1.92
Portal.....		1.91
Kermit.....		1.91
CANADA.		
Emerson.....		\$1.51
Gretna.....		1.80
Haskett.....		1.58
Snowflake.....		1.70
Crystal City.....		No market.
Cartwright.....		1.83
Bannerman.....		1.75
Coulter.....		1.82
Lyleton.....		1.60
Carrievale.....		1.68
North Portal.....		1.71
Estevan.....		1.60

You will see that our farmers have had an advantage over the Canadian farmer of just about the amount of the tariff, 25 cents per bushel. Why do you want to deprive him of that? Heaven knows he is not getting wealthy raising flax.

TARIFF A LOCAL QUESTION.

Mr. President, I have stated that you seem to wish to punish the northern farmer because he is not affiliated with your own party. I am borne out in this by the fact that while you put American wheat produced by the northern farmer on the free list, where he has the worst kind of competition in the world, you protect the rice farmer of the South 33½ per cent on his product. Why the discrimination against the northern farmer?

The farmer may be slow, but he is quite sure. He may forget, but the hard raps of poverty can jog his memory. Once pass this accursed measure and before 1914 he will be fully awake to the realization of the offense committed against him. He will begin to compare the prices he has received during the last 8 or 10 years with the prices under your free trade with Canada and the world. He will change the complexion of the House of Representatives, if this bill passes, mighty suddenly; and if he can not change the Senate within that time it will not be because of a disinclination, but because of a political impossibility. Pass this bill as it is and unless this cut-throat policy which annihilated the Republican Party in 1912 continues there will not be a Democratic State in the whole North. It took the farmer 16 years to forget the last Democratic policy. Pass this bill and the generation living will never forget you.

AMERICAN SUPPLY NOT WORLD'S SUPPLY GOVERNS VALUES.

The great bulk of the wheat crop of the world is raised in the northern hemisphere. Its quantity is well known by October 1 of the year in which it is raised. The northern wheat estimate can not affect prices very materially before the middle of the ensuing winter. Therefore the prevailing price of wheat for the months of October, November, and December may be said to be founded almost wholly upon the supply furnished by the crop of that year.

A glance at the grain statistics for a number of years will demonstrate how much greater is the influence of home supply over world supply in fixing our prices. For illustration, in

1908 the world produced 3,181,548,000 bushels. The average price in Minneapolis for the months of October, November, and December of that year was \$1.06. In 1909 the world produced 3,584,739,000 bushels; average price for said months, \$1.05.

Thus it will be seen that an increase of 400,000,000 bushels in the world's supply scarcely affected our home price. But how about our own supply? The States of North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota produced, in 1911, 131,935,000 bushels of wheat. The Minneapolis price for the months of October, November, and December averaged \$1.04. The same States in 1912 produced 263,043,000 bushels of wheat; average price paid in Minneapolis for said months, 85 cents. There is the real influence on grain prices. Four hundred million bushels difference in the world supply scarcely affected our prices, a difference of over a hundred million bushels in these States and about a hundred million bushels excess in the supply of the entire United States brought the prices down from \$1.04 to 85 cents per bushel.

For the first time in about 15 years we are nearly on an export basis in these three States. Our wheat has dropped 20

cents per bushel, and the Democratic Party says it must stay on an export basis—it must stay down. The time when the farmer needs the better prices for his crop is when it is short. With protection he will have this automatic adjustment and receive his better prices when he needs them most. With your free-trade policy, if the world has a good crop and these States a poor crop, the farmer is bound to lose heavily. So by this bill you compel him to be on the losing side whichever way the crop conditions may turn.

DANGER OF IMPORTATION.

I sometimes wonder, Mr. President, whether the Democratic Senators who vote away the interest of many millions of our best citizens fully realize the danger to which they are about to expose them. Do you realize that the grain supply of the world is increasing by leaps and bounds, and more rapidly than any other product? That you may not be as blind to the facts as you are deaf to the demand for fairness, I have prepared a table showing the increase in the production of wheat, oats, barley, and flaxseed by the principal producing countries from 1900 to 1912. The table is as follows:

Production of wheat, oats, barley, and flaxseed by the principal producing countries, from 1900 to 1912.

	Wheat production.			Oat production.		
	1900	1912	Increase.	1900	1912	Increase.
	Bushels.	Bushels.	Per cent.	Bushels.	Bushels.	Per cent.
United States.....	522,000,000	730,267,000	39	809,126,000	1,418,337,000	75
Canada.....	53,701,000	199,236,000	271	154,612,000	361,733,000	134
Provinces of Canada west of Great Lakes region.....	22,436,000	185,379,000	726	62,092,000	224,208,000	261
Australia.....	40,000,000	73,213,000	83	7,290,000	7,900,000	8
Argentina.....	101,655,000	166,191,000	63	2,273,000	69,169,000	2,952
Russian Empire.....	458,153,000	727,011,000	59	853,696,000	1,067,584,000	25

	Barley production.			Flaxseed production.		
	1900	1912	Increase.	1900	1912	Increase.
	Bushels.	Bushels.	Per cent.	Bushels.	Bushels.	Per cent.
United States.....	58,926,000	223,824,000	80	20,000,000	19,370,000
Canada.....	23,975,000	44,014,000	80	1,500,000	7,867,000	1,473
Provinces of Canada west of Great Lakes region.....	6,532,000	27,037,000	313	315,000	7,730,000	2,354
Australia.....	2,030,000	1,970,000
Argentina.....	8,865,000	23,424,000	164
Russian Empire.....	236,981,000	464,124,000	96	20,670,000	21,549,000	4

¹ Estimated.

I only call attention to the increases by percentage:

	Per cent.
In the United States the wheat crop increased in these 12 years.....	39
In Canada.....	271
In the Provinces of Canada west of the Great Lakes.....	726
In Australia.....	83
In Argentina.....	63
In the Russian Empire.....	59

With that enormous increase in production, are you still frightened lest there will not be food enough produced in the world for city people?

Turn to the oats production and we will find that the increase—

	Per cent.
In the United States in those years was.....	75
In Canada.....	134
In the Provinces of Canada west of the Great Lakes.....	261
In Australia.....	8
In Argentina.....	2,952
In the Russian Empire.....	25

With this enormous increase in the oats production of the world, are you still fearful of the sufficiency of supply for man and beast?

Turning to barley, we will find that the increase in the United States—

	Per cent.
In those years was.....	280
In Canada.....	80
In the Provinces of Canada west of the Great Lakes.....	313
In the Russian Empire.....	96

Does this look as though there were danger of a barley famine and any long and continued suffering on the part of your allies, the American Brewing Association?

Turning to flax, I find in the United States there has been practically no increase. This is due to some extent to the heavy loss in the flax crop of 1912 by reason of early frost and snow. To make this up, however, you will find that the Provinces of Canada west of the Great Lake region increased 2,354 per cent; Argentina, 164 per cent.

Does this look as though the Steel Trust and other manufacturers of steel products were in any immediate danger of an under supply of flaxseed oil for their paints and varnishes?

But if the phantom of starvation still haunts you, let me attempt to banish it by turning on a flood of light on the possibilities of food supply right at your door, as you propose to turn on that flood of grain from Canada to bewilder and overwhelm the farmers of my State. I know that those who have not made a study of the fact comprehend very little about the country that is immediately north of the United States and lying west of the Red River of the North. There are five or six great Provinces, and any one of them would make five or six of the average States of this Union. Every one of them is fertile, every one is capable of producing a greater per acre crop than can be produced for the most part in the United States:

	Acres.
Saskatchewan has.....	160,416,000
Manitoba has.....	47,188,480
Alberta has.....	162,000,000

Total..... 369,604,480

A careful and most conservative estimate has been made of the tillable acreage in said Provinces by the Dominion of Canada. The following is the estimate:

	Acres.
Saskatchewan tillable acreage.....	86,826,240
Manitoba.....	27,000,000
Alberta.....	100,000,000

Total..... 213,826,240

These figures perhaps do not give to the average person a very definite idea as to the size of these Provinces. To make this more clear, Saskatchewan is as large as the States of Idaho, Iowa, Illinois, and Michigan combined, and that Province is capable of producing much more than all those States combined. Manitoba is larger than North Dakota and South Dakota combined. All of this vast territory is being brought into closer communication with the world by the great trans-

continental lines of railway with their great number of feeding lines.

As I have shown, the average crop of the world is about three and one-half billion bushels of wheat. Those Provinces of Canada alone can easily duplicate the present world's supply. It would produce it to-day if there were the demand. The possibilities of that country stand as an enormous club to drive down the value of every cereal produced in the Northwest.

Unlike the United States, which consumes nearly all of its wheat crop, Canada does not consume one-seventh of its western crop. That vast surplus must go into the world's market. Its nearest market is the Minneapolis, Duluth, Buffalo, and other mills of the Northwest. Open the floodgates of our present tariff wall and it will immediately pour over and into this country and level our prices to the world prices and keep them level for at least a century.

If the farmer were more prosperous than the rest of the world, I could see some reason for legislating against his interests, but as he is far less prosperous than any other people in the United States, further depressing his prices, further aggravating the injustices of his situation, seems to me to be almost criminal.

PRESENT IMPORTATIONS UNDER PROTECTION.

Mr. President, I am here to declare that if the tariff should be so high as to absolutely prohibit importations of every farm product, it would not improperly or unduly increase the value of those products. Why? Because we are still an exporting Nation. We are still capable of oversupplying our own markets. We have the land to produce all that the American people can consume for years to come, and with proper and justly profitable prices we will meet every demand for home consumption. Such exclusion of foreign products would simply put the farmer on a fair trading basis with the consumer.

Even with our present protection, importations are coming in to such an extent as to keep our prices down as low as, or lower than, they ought in conscience to be kept down. Then why increase the importations to drive them still lower?

I ask here to insert a table showing importations of farm and dairy products during the past five years:

Importation of farm and dairy products.

BARLEY.

(Duty, 30 per cent.)

Year.	Number of bushels.	Value.
1908.....	1 198,741	\$143,407
1909.....	2,644	1,440
1910.....	2,650	1,196
1911.....	186,246	98,794
1912.....	2 2,768,474	1,929,214

CORN.

(Duty, 15 cents per bushel.)

Year.	Number of bushels.	Value.
1908.....	20,312	\$15,536
1909.....	258,065	189,465
1910.....		
1911.....		
1912.....	53,425	47,936

OATS.

(Duty, 15 cents per bushel.)

Year.	Number of bushels.	Value.
1908.....	384,307	\$179,714
1909.....	6,666,989	2,651,699
1910.....	1,034,511	400,920
1911.....	107,318	41,990
1912.....	2,622,357	1,063,470

WHEAT.

(Duty, 25 cents per bushel.)

Year.	Number of bushels.	Value.
1908.....	341,617	\$329,766
1909.....	41,082	36,741
1910.....	164,201	150,561
1911.....	509,439	476,586
1912.....	2,699,130	2,212,887

¹ Of this amount 198,118 bushels were imported from Canada.

² A shortage in the United States of about 13,000,000 bushels from two years previous.

³ Of this amount 195,094 bushels came from Argentina and 25,912 from Mexico. Corn very high in United States at that time.

⁴ Of this amount 5,047,636 bushels came from Canada.

⁵ Of this amount 2,609,307 came from Canada.

⁶ Of this amount 2,673,060 bushels came from Canada.

Importation of farm and dairy products—Continued.

In addition there was imported, principally from Canada, wheat flour as follows:

Year.	Barrels.
1908.....	30,593
1909.....	92,413
1910.....	144,759
1911.....	141,582
1912.....	158,777

A barrel of flour requires about $4\frac{1}{2}$ bushels of wheat.

COMBINED WHEAT AND FLOUR.

	Number of bushels.	Value.
1908.....	514,785	\$499,340
1909.....	456,940	406,676
1910.....	805,606	733,101
1911.....	1,113,705	1,046,882
1912.....	2,927,377	2,390,448

FLAXSEED.

(Duty, 25 cents per bushel.)

Year.	Number of bushels.	Value.
1908.....	57,419	\$71,625
1909.....	593,698	831,871
1910.....	5,002,496	8,548,837
1911.....	10,499,227	21,379,180
1912.....	6,841,806	12,995,250

HAY.

(Duty, \$4 per ton.)

Year.	Tons.	Value.
1908.....	10,063	\$89,808
1909.....	6,712	60,538
1910.....	296,829	775,916
1911.....	336,757	2,544,058
1912.....	609,004	6,473,230

EGGS.

(Duty, 4 cents per dozen.)

Year.	Dozens.	Value.
1908.....	231,099	\$25,850
1909.....	288,650	36,937
1910.....	818,267	110,738
1911.....	1,573,398	255,744
1912.....	973,053	147,123

BUTTER.

(Duty, 6 cents per pound.)

Year.	Pounds.	Value.
1908.....	780,608	\$182,897
1909.....	646,320	141,917
1910.....	1,360,245	298,023
1911.....	1,007,826	247,961
1912.....	1,025,668	237,154

¹ From Canada 1,410,398 bushels, from Argentina 5,021,137, from India 2,333,863.

² Practically all from Canada.

³ Principally from Canada.

You propose not only to reduce the farm prices below a proper living basis, but also to surrender and make up by some other method of taxation the millions upon millions of dollars of revenue.

In addition to the importations which I have mentioned, we are to-day importing meats from Australia and other countries, and with free meat you can find an opportunity to injure and oppress the American farmer.

Mr. President, we are to-day back upon an export basis. Wheat to-day is higher in Winnipeg than it is in the United States. Why? For two reasons: Money stringency, depression, and lack of confidence, combined with an oversupply upon our own part, have made our wheat to-day lower than wheat in Winnipeg. You can not account for this on any ground of world supply and demand, because the Winnipeg price must be upon the basis of export, and in 1913 it is higher than that in the United States.

DESTRUCTION OF MARKET FOR FLAX STRAW.

Mr. President, I can not accuse the Democratic Party of working blindly on this tariff bill. That party has not only been lynx-eyed in finding ways in which it could injure the northwestern farmer, but seems also to be possessed with the lynx instinct to destroy wherever it can smell blood.

I had hoped that the party might possibly overlook a little avenue—very little one indeed—where the farmer, in case his crops were destroyed by drought or his flax failed to fill, might secure a few dollars by the sale of the straw, possibly enough to pay the tax on the land. We have a number of very little tow mills, as they are called, in our State, which pay the farmer from \$2 to \$3 per ton for his flax straw, just enough to pay him to load it and haul it to town, if he lives within a few miles, as it requires two men and a team to load and otherwise handle the straw. You can see how small is his profit. If he had to hire both men, he could not get enough out of the flax straw to pay for hauling it. I hoped this little mite, which we call "hard-times revenue," was so small that the great Democratic Party would miss it; but like that evening animal which can not see the room or ceiling around which it flies, yet can see clearly the eye of a needle, so the Democratic Party, floundering all around this tariff subject, caught sight of this little \$2 or \$3 hard-time money which the farmer could get out of his flax straw. And this little hard-times income must be destroyed.

The Ways and Means Committee of the House, who gave a hearing to those who manufacture tow from this straw, reduced the duty on tow from \$20 to \$10 per ton. But the Democratic majority of the Senate reasoned well as to what the effect of this \$10 duty on tow might be. They said, "If we allow this \$10, some of these tow mills might survive, and if they do survive, they might still buy some of this flax straw from the farmers, and we can not allow these bloated mortgagors to find new ways of paying the interest on their mortgages."

Just why this party left 15 cents a bushel on flax and barley and 6 cents a bushel on oats I can not say. I can only account for it on the ground, either that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] convinced them that the farmers would not receive any benefit from this meager tariff on these two crops, and therefore they might as well use this cheap bait to catch a few stray votes next year, or that they wanted to show to the farmers of the country that the Democratic Party had not been wholly swallowed by the brewers and flax importers.

I dare say there is not one man among those who cut down the flaxseed duty who has the slightest idea of what it costs to thrash a bushel of flaxseed, much less what it costs to raise it.

You know that under ordinary conditions we never get full benefit of the duty on cereals. I have shown you that with a 25-cent duty on wheat our average benefit or protection has been between 10 and 12 cents per bushel.

Mr. President, representing a State which is wholly agricultural in its interests, owning considerable lands in the State myself, operating, or attempting to operate, and cultivate and raise crops on those lands, familiar with the cost of land, farm machinery, stock, labor, and so forth, familiar with the chances one takes against loss of crop, partial or in whole, I can speak with a degree of accuracy upon what ought to be the price realized from the products of the soil, what the farmer should receive for his wheat, flax, barley, oats, and potatoes, in order to be able to run his farm, where he must hire some of the work done. He should receive for his wheat at least, per bushel, \$1.40; for his flax, \$2; for his barley, 75 cents; for his oats, 65 cents, and for his potatoes, 60 cents.

Give him the American market that of right belongs to him and in a very short time, when consumption and production about equal each other, he will receive this much for his grain. He is to-day receiving for his wheat about 80 cents; for his flax, \$1.22; for his oats, 32 cents; for his barley, 38 cents; for his potatoes, 50 cents.

I had a telegram from the State a few days ago, saying that the crop in the State will not in any event be more than one-half of what it was last year. In other words, more than half a crop can not be expected.

Reports from Canada show a large northwestern crop. With only half a crop to our credit, the farmers of this country ought to have a better price per bushel for that crop. But fearing that they might have a little benefit for the natural law of compensation, you are about to unload on their market and overwhelm it with the vast surplus of the Canadian northwest.

I ought to say a word right here with reference to the countervailing duties. I notice that you finally provide by your caucus that wheat shall be free to every country that will allow our own free. I think you make reference to that with one other product—semolina.

Our importations of cereal products will come mostly from Canada. Flax and some wheat may, under free trade, come from Venezuela. Although Canada may have a duty to-day of 12 cents per bushel upon wheat, she certainly will not hold against her own citizens that duty when she knows that they

can get 8 or 12 cents a bushel better for a while in our own States. As we all know, whenever the Government introduces a bill pertaining to the fiscal policy of Canada, that bill becomes a law the day after its introduction, and it remains the law until it has been changed by Parliament. So we will get no benefit with this countervailing duty. It will go out of existence, just as soon as it will be beneficial to the other country to have it out of existence.

PROTECTION NECESSARY TO KEEP OPEN TOW MILLS.

What do you expect to accomplish by destroying the tow industry in the United States? The tow made from the farmer's flax straw is not used for clothing. Fine linen fabrics are not made from it. It is used for upholstering furniture, car seats, and so forth, for packing or lining for refrigerator cars, and for wrapping and writing paper. The farmer can raise flax straw that will produce as fine linen as anywhere in the world, but under present conditions in the labor market he can not afford to care for and market a flax of sufficient fiber length to make linen fabrics. But he can raise flax for the seed, and after thrashing it he can sell this straw, broken by the separator, and therefore of short fiber, for these other purposes. And so long as the tow mills can compete in tow products with Canada or Russia he will have a market. When those mills are closed he will not have a market.

From the best information I can secure I am convinced that free tow of flax will close every tow mill in the country and thereby render worthless every ton of flax straw raised in the United States, amounting, I believe, to about 8,000,000 tons.

The House committee took off all the duty on flax straw. This would be an injury to the American farmer in some sections, but as the price of flax straw is very little, it can not be hauled or freighted to advantage from any great distance. So the farmers would still hold their markets in their near vicinity. They would still have a market for flax straw if the mills were kept running. But the House, while it reduced the duty on tow of flax from \$20 to \$10 per ton, still left some protection, possibly enough to allow the mills to survive. Now, why did the Democratic members of the Committee on Finance remove all duty? At whose instance was it done? Did the rope manufacturers appear before your subcommittees and ask for free raw material? Did you call the farmer before your committees? Why should he not appear? He is worth more to the country than all the rope twisters in the world. Why should his interests be wantonly thrown away at the behest of the manufacturers?

This is not a question of cheap clothing. The hackling, retting, and scutching of flax straw for the linen fabrics is so tedious and laborious that a ton of the tow thus produced is worth as high as 18 cents per pound, or \$360 per ton, while the tow that is produced from the straw furnished by the farmers for car linings and similar purposes is worth, according to the quality at the mills, from \$18 to \$60 per ton, and to this must be added the freight of from \$3 to \$9.60 a ton for transportation to the East where it is used or manufactured.

Mr. President, I know how futile is every effort to make any change in the cereal paragraphs. I may hope, however, that the Democratic majority in the Senate, after they have thoroughly had laid before them the tow proposition, after they thoroughly understand that this little hard-earned money of the farmer will not affect the linen cloths of any character, after they have learned to what extent the farmer will be injured in general, will agree with us to place that little product back upon the protected list to the extent of \$10 per ton.

I will go more fully and freely into the question of the tow manufacture at some future time, as I shall into the question of the meat products, on behalf of the farmers of the United States.

PRINTING OF TARIFF BILL.

Mr. SMOOT. From the Committee on Printing I report back favorably House concurrent resolution No. 11. I ask for its immediate consideration, and I desire in this connection to make a short statement.

The concurrent resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 30,000 copies of the bill H. R. 3321, with amendments, as reported in the Senate July 11, 1913, 20,000 copies for the use of the House and 10,000 copies for the use of the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the estimated cost of printing the 30,000 copies in bill form with the index is \$4,475; in bill form without the index, \$3,586; and in document form, \$1,192.40. I do not desire to make an amendment to the resolution, because it would have to go back to the House, and everyone interested in receiving a copy of the bill wants it at once.

I have heard from Mr. MANN, of Illinois, the author of the House concurrent resolution, and he is agreeable to have the

bill printed in document form, as these copies are only to be sent out through the country for information.

Without offering an amendment, I will simply state that it will be understood that the 30,000 copies will be printed in document form at a saving of nearly \$2,000.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to inquire of the Senator if in document form it will have an index?

Mr. SMOOT. It will have an index.

Mr. NORRIS. It would be almost worthless without an index. The index will add greatly to its value.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

HOOR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. SWANSON. In the absence of the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN], at his request, I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 2 o'clock on Thursday next.

Mr. SIMMONS. In view of the fact that I gave notice with reference to a proposed meeting of the Senate on Wednesday, I desire to say that after conference with my colleagues on this and the other side of the Chamber, an adjournment until Thursday will be satisfactory.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia moves that when the Senate adjourns to-day it shall adjourn to meet at 2 o'clock on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SWANSON subsequently said: I have just been informed by the junior Senator from Indiana that he desires to have a meeting of the Senate to-morrow to offer possibly some amendments to the Erdman Act, which is a very important matter. So I move to reconsider the vote by which the Senate agreed that when it adjourns to-day it will adjourn until 2 o'clock on Thursday.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. SWANSON. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn until 2 o'clock p. m. to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I offer the following resolution (S. Res. 113) for reference to the Committee on Rules:

Resolved, That Rule XIX of the standing rules of the Senate be amended by adding the following:

"Sec. 6. That the Senate may at any time, upon motion of a Senator, fix a day and hour for a final vote upon any matter pending in the Senate: *Provided, however*, That this rule shall not be invoked to prevent debate by any Senator who requests opportunity to express his views upon such pending matter within a time to be fixed by the Senate.

"The notice to be given by the Senate under this section, except by consent, shall not be less than a week, unless such requests be made within the last two weeks of the session."

For the foregoing stated purpose the following rules, namely, VII, VIII, IX, X, XII, XXII, XXVI, and XL, are modified:

"Any Senator may demand of a Senator making a motion if it be made for dilatory or obstructive purposes, and if the Senator making the motion declines or evades an answer or concedes the motion to have been made for such purposes, the President of the Senate shall declare such motion out of order."

Mr. President, the minority veto in the Senate, with its power to prevent the majority from fulfilling its pledges to the American people, should end. The right to obstruct the public business by a factional filibuster must cease. The power of an individual Senator to coerce or blackmail the Senate must be terminated. These national evils can no longer be concealed by the false cloak of "freedom of debate."

Those who defend the antiquated rule of unlimited parliamentary debate do so chiefly on the ground of precedent. The precedents of the intellectual world, of the parliamentary world, are entirely against the preposterous rule which has been permitted to survive in the United States Senate alone. What are the precedents of other parliamentary bodies.

PRECEDENTS.

The precedents in the State of Maine and in every New England State, in every Atlantic State, in every Gulf State, in every Pacific State, in every Rocky Mountain State, in every Mississippi Valley State, and in every State bordering on Canada are against unlimited debate or the minority veto. In both the senate and house of every State the precedent is to the contrary.

The precedent is against it in New Hampshire.

The precedent is against it in Vermont.

The precedent is against it in Massachusetts.

The precedent is against it in Rhode Island and Connecticut.

What Senator from the New England States will venture to say that the precedents of every single one of the New England

States are unsound, unwise, and ought to be modified to conform to the superior wisdom of the Senate rule?

The precedent is against it in New York, and in Pennsylvania, and in New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and West Virginia. What Senator upon this floor representing these Commonwealths will venture to say that the people of his State have adopted a false standard of parliamentary practice which they ought to abandon for the superior virtue of the minority veto established in the Senate by an archaic rule of 1806?

The precedent in North Carolina, in South Carolina, in Georgia, in Alabama, in Florida, in Mississippi, and Tennessee is against it. Will the Senators from these States say that the parliamentary rule and practice of their own States, which they have the honor to represent upon this floor, are unwise and not safe and should be modified to comply with the superior rule of the minority veto?

The precedents of Louisiana, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, and Kentucky, of Missouri, Iowa, Wisconsin, and Montana, of the Dakotas, of Nebraska and Kansas, are all against this unwise practice of the United States Senate.

The precedents of Colorado, Wyoming, and Minnesota, of Idaho, of Nevada, of Arizona and New Mexico, and of the great Pacific States—Washington, Oregon, and California—provide for the closing of debate and are against the evil practice which still remains in vogue in the United States Senate.

Why, Mr. President, the precedent of every city, big and little, in the United States is against the right of minority veto under the false pretense of "freedom of debate."

Every one of the 48 States of the Union, while permitting freedom of debate, has set us the wise and virtuous precedent of permitting the control by the majority. I remind every Senator in this body that in his own State his legislative assembly, whether in the house or in the senate, does not permit a minority veto under the pretense of freedom of debate. It is the rule of common sense and of common honesty.

In the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States the right to move the previous question and limit debate has been wisely and profitably practiced since its foundation.

ENGLISH PRECEDENTS.

The rule of the majority is the rule in all the parliaments of English-speaking people. In the Parliament of Great Britain, in the House of Lords, the "contents" pass to the right and the "not contents" pass to the left, and the majority rules.

In the House of Commons the "ayes" pass to the right and the "noes" pass to the left, and the majority rules. (*Encyclopædia Britannica*, vol. 20, p. 856.)

The great English statesman, Mr. Gladstone, having found that the efficiency of Parliament was destroyed by the right of unlimited debate, was led to propose cloture in the first week of the session of 1882, moving this resolution on the 20th of February, and expressing the opinion that the House should settle its own procedure. The acts of Mr. Gladstone and others of like opinion finally led to the termination of unlimited debate in the procedure of Parliament. In these debates every fallacious argument now advanced by those who wish to retain unlimited debate in the United States Senate has been abundantly answered, leaving no ground of sound reasoning to reconsider these stale and exploded arguments.

The cloture of debate is very commonly used in the Houses of Parliament in Great Britain, for example, in standing order No. 26. The return to order of the House of Commons, dated December 12, 1906, shows that the cloture was moved 112 times. (See vol. 94, Great Britain House of Commons, sessional papers, 1906.)

FRANCE.

In France the cloture is moved by one or more members crying out "La cloture!"

The president immediately puts the question, and if a member of the minority wishes to speak he is allowed to assign his reasons against the close of the debate, but no one can speak in support of the motion and only one member against it. The question is then put by the president, "Shall the debate be closed?" and if it is resolved in the affirmative the debate is closed and the main question is put to the vote.

M. Guizot, speaking on the efficacy of the cloture before a committee of the House of Commons in 1848, said:

I think that in our chamber it was an indispensable power, and I think it has not been used unjustly or improperly generally. Calling to mind what has passed of late years, I do not recollect any serious and honest complaint of the cloture. In the French Chambers, as they have been during the last 34 years, no member can imagine that the debate would have been properly conducted without the power of pronouncing the cloture.

He also stated in another part of his evidence that—

Before the introduction of the cloture in 1814 the debates were protracted indefinitely, and not only were they protracted, but at the end, when the majority wished to put an end to the debate and the minority

would not, the debate became very violent for protracting the debate, and out of the house among the public it was a source of ridicule.

The French also allow the previous question, and it can always be moved; it can not be proposed on motions for which urgency is claimed, except after the report of the committee of initiative. (Dickinson's Rules and Procedure of Foreign Parliaments, p. 426.)

GERMANY.

The majority rule controls likewise in the German Empire and they have the cloture upon the support of 30 members of the house, which is immediately voted on at any time by a show of hands or by the ayes and noes.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.

In Austria-Hungary, motions for the closing of the debate are to be put to the vote at once by the president without any question, and thereupon the matter is determined. If the majority decides for a close of the debate, the members whose names are put down to speak for or against the motions may choose from amongst them one speaker on each side, and the matter is disposed of by voting a simple yes or no. (Ibid., p. 404.)

AUSTRIA.

Austria also, in its independent houses of Parliament, has the cloture, which may be put to the vote at any time in both houses, and a small majority suffices to carry it. This is done, however, without interrupting any speech in actual course of delivery; and when the vote to close the debate is passed each side has one member represented in a final speech on the question. (Ibid., p. 409.)

BELGIUM.

In Belgium they have the cloture, and if the prime minister and president of the chamber are satisfied that there is need of closing the debate a hint is given to some member to raise the cry of "La cloture," after a member of the opposition has concluded his speech, and upon the demand of 10 members, granting permission, however, to speak for or against the motion under restrictions. The method here does not prevent any reasonable debate, but permits a termination of the debate by the will of the majority. The same rule is followed in the Senate of Belgium. (Ibid., p. 420.)

DENMARK.

In Denmark also they have the cloture, which can be proposed by the president of the Danish chambers, which is decided by the chamber without debate. Fifteen members of the Landsting may demand the cloture. (Ibid., p. 422.)

NETHERLANDS.

In both houses of the Parliament of the Netherlands they have the cloture. Five members of the First Chamber may propose it and five members may propose it in the Second Chamber. They have the majority rule. (Ibid., p. 461.)

PORTUGAL.

In Portugal they have the cloture in both chambers, and debate may be closed by a special motion, without discretion. In the upper house they permit two to speak in favor of and two against it. The cloture may be voted. (Ibid., p. 469.)

SPAIN.

The cloture in Spain may be said to exist indirectly, and to result from the action allowed the president on the order of parliamentary discussion. (Ibid., p. 477.)

SWITZERLAND.

The cloture exists in Switzerland both in the Conseil des Etats and Conseil National.

Many of the ablest and best Senators who have ever been members of this body have urged the abatement of this evil, including such men as Senator George G. Vest, of Missouri; Senator Orville H. Platt, of Connecticut; Senator David B. Hill, of New York; Senator George F. Hoar, of Massachusetts; and Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, of Massachusetts, who introduced resolutions or spoke for the amendment of this evil practice of the Senate. (Appendix, Note A.)

Mr. President, the time has come in the history of the United States when Congress shall be directly responsive to the will of the majority of 90,000,000 of people without delay, evasion, or obstruction. We are in the midst of the most gigantic century in the history of the world, when every reason looking to the welfare and advance of the human race bids us march forward in compliance with the magnificent intelligence and humane impulses of the American people.

We have the most important problems before us—financial, commercial, sociological. Fifteen great propositions of improvement of government were pledged by the recent Democratic platform, and almost a like number were pledged by other party platforms. We have work to do that means the preservation, the conservation, and the development of human life, of

human energy, of human health. We have before us the great problems which mean the development of this vast country, and we should have the machinery of government by which to respond with reasonable promptitude to mature public opinion, but the rules of the Senate have been such as to prevent action; the rules of the Senate are such as to prevent action now with regard to the great questions before the country. The rules of the Senate have put the power in the hands of a small faction or of a single individual to obstruct, without reason, and to prevent action by Congress. I favor the right of the majority of the Senate to control the Senate after giving every reasonable freedom of debate to the opposition, so that the people of the country may have both sides of every proposition. But I am strongly opposed to the minority veto, or to a single Senator obstructing and preventing the control of the Senate by the responsible majority.

In a short session of Congress the Senate will appropriate a thousand million dollars in less than 350 working hours. Each working hour means the appropriation of \$3,000,000 of the hard-earned taxes taken from the labor of the American people. Every two minutes the Senate averages an appropriation of \$100,000 of taxes, and yet, instead of addressing itself to a comprehension of the necessity for such taxes, for such expenditure, a single Senator, or a small faction or a minority, may detain the Senate for hours and for days and for weeks while great questions of public policy wait, leaving the Senate to be thus distracted by filibustering tactics, discussions of immaterial or trivial matters, reading of worthless papers and statistics, last year's almanac—in a deliberate obstruction of the majority by the minority.

EXTREME DIFFICULTY IN OBTAINING LEGISLATION THAT IS CONFESSEDLY OF VALUE, EVEN WITHOUT A FILIBUSTER.

Mr. President, before a bill can be passed that is desired by the American people, no matter how worthy, it must first be carefully drawn, submitted to the House of Representatives, and by the House submitted to a committee, and almost invariably such a bill is sent from the committee of the House to the executive department for a report; and when the report comes in it is considered in the committee, and finally and usually, where the majority desires the bill passed, it will be reported back to the House—abundant opportunity having been thus given to discover its weak points or defects.

When it goes to the House it takes its place upon the calendar and awaits the time with patience when it can be taken up on the calendar.

It must be read three times in the House, it must be printed, it is discussed in the House, and, finally, if after having passed every criticism and scrutiny it be approved by the majority of the House, it is signed by the Speaker and finds its way to the United States Senate. When it reaches the Senate it is again sent to a committee, the committee further considers it, and, finally, if a majority favor, it is reported back to the Senate to take its place upon the calendar. And many a good bill has died on the calendar in the Senate because of a single objection to it—what might be called the private right of veto by an individual Senator. If at last it is permitted, by consent, to come before the Senate and does not excite any prolonged debate, it may become a law by reason of a majority vote of those present. But if anywhere along the line of this slow, deliberate procedure any serious objection is raised by a minority, or by a Senator, either can by dilatory motions, by insisting upon hearings, by making the point of "no quorum," by using a Senator's right to object and demand the regular order, by using his position to ask reconsideration and a rehearing, or, perhaps, an additional report from the executive department, and then demanding hearings in the executive department while the report is delayed, and in a thousand other ingenious ways a single Senator, much less a faction or willful minority, can make it almost impossible to pass a bill of great merit. For three years I have been trying to pass a bill to establish an improved organization of the Bureau of Public Health and have been unable to get any action, for or against, by Congress. I only refer to this as an example of many meritorious measures which have never been acted upon, and for which there is a powerful matured public sentiment urgently insisting upon action.

The Senate of the United States has rules for its conduct that make it almost impossible to get a bill through, except by unanimous consent, where a resolute minority is opposed to the passage of the bill. Under the so-called privilege of "freedom of debate," a group of Senators can hold up any measure indefinitely by endless talk in relays and by the use of dilatory motions, making the point of "no quorum" moving to "adjourn," moving to "take a recess," moving to "adjourn to a day certain," reading for an hour or so from Martin Chuzzlewit or

Pickwick Papers, making the point of "no quorum," moving to "adjourn," making the point of "no quorum," moving to "adjourn to a day certain," moving to "take a recess," moving to go into "executive session," and, under the rules, may read a few chapters of Huckleberry Finn—and this puerile conduct is dignified by the false pretense of being "freedom of debate," when, in point of fact, it is nothing of the kind. It is the minority obstruction and the personal veto under the pretense of freedom of debate, under the false pretense of freedom of debate, under the ridiculous pretense of freedom of debate, under the contemptible and odious pretense of freedom of debate.

It is not freedom of debate.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. OWEN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GRONNA. I will ask the Senator from Oklahoma if he does not believe that the defeat of the Indian appropriation bill at the last session of Congress was in the interest of the public?

Mr. OWEN. I think perhaps it was improved by this Congress.

Mr. GRONNA. Is it not true that the Indian appropriation bill which passed Congress at this session is a better bill than the one which was before this body during the last session of Congress?

Mr. OWEN. It is practically the same, but it has been somewhat improved.

Mr. GRONNA. And the bill which was before Congress at that time was defeated by one Senator, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL], was it not?

Mr. OWEN. There was a delay of the bill by the Senator from New Mexico which resulted in its defeat.

Mr. GRONNA. If the Senator from Oklahoma will permit me, I will ask if the rules had been changed as he now indicates he would like to have them changed, in his judgment would it have been possible, with a majority for it, to have defeated that bill?

Mr. OWEN. I think not; but a discussion of the conditions in old Mexico which killed the bill was irrelevant and not justified by any public need.

Mr. GRONNA. I desire to ask the Senator from Oklahoma another question. The Senator complains because a certain measure which he has had before Congress for a long time has not been passed. Will the Senator from Oklahoma state to the Senate that a majority of the Senate have been in favor of that particular measure?

Mr. OWEN. It is impossible for anyone to say positively what a majority favor until they are permitted to vote upon a measure; but I have no doubt a large majority did favor it.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I can not comprehend that there is any necessity for protecting a majority. It seems to me that a rule to protect a minority is of more importance to the country than a rule to protect a majority.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I shall not at this moment deflect from my argument to answer the observations of the Senator from North Dakota. I shall do that at a later time, because the matter is going to lead to considerable debate.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I am sorry I interrupted the Senator, but I could not let go unchallenged the statement made by the Senator from Oklahoma when he said it was odious to operate under the rules that we have because certain measures have been held up. I tried to point out to the Senator that the country has benefited under the present rules.

Mr. OWEN. The country has been very greatly harmed under the present rules, as I shall show before this debate concludes. At present I am simply laying a preamble for the consideration of this matter. It is going to take much time. It is going to be debated at considerable length in this body. It is going before the country for the country to determine whether or not men shall be permitted by the people of the United States to stand upon the floor of the Senate and favor the control of the majority by the minority and favor a policy making it impossible for party pledges to be carried out in this Republic.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. OWEN. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. It occurred to me that while the Senator from North Dakota had given an instance in which, according to his judgment, a bill was odious and was defeated a number of other very meritorious bills were defeated because of the filibustering tactics which were adopted with reference to the Indian appropriation bill. I have in mind at this moment the sundry civil bill, which involved the expenditure of more than

\$100,000,000. That bill was defeated in the last minutes of the last session simply because the Senate could not control debate.

Mr. OWEN. Oh, yes; that is true. I will not say there is not the possibility, under some circumstances, of some good ensuing from a vigorous protest by the minority. I am perfectly willing to agree to that. But yielding that point in no way affects the validity of the argument that the majority should be charged with the responsibility of government; and I in no wise modify the comment I have made upon the odious and ridiculous pretense of "freedom of debate" in this body, which has served as a cloak for a minority veto and for improper processes in this body. I say it is not freedom of debate. The minority veto is, in effect, a denial of freedom of debate. A man in charge of an important bill is driven to refrain from debating the bill because he would be playing into the hands of the opponents of the bill, who are trying to kill the bill by exhausting the patience of the Senate by endless volubility and unending dilatory motions.

This thoughtless rule of unlimited freedom of debate was adopted in 1806, when there were 34 Senators, who met together to discuss their common affairs in courtesy and good faith, when only a very few bills were brought before the Senate. They had no conception that unlimited freedom of debate really meant a minority veto. Now that the Senate has 96 Members, representing 90,000,000 people, when its interests are of the most gigantic importance, when its modern problems of stupendous consequence are demanding prompt and virile action, when hundreds of important bills are pending, this hoary-headed reprobate rises up and strikes a posture of inscrutable wisdom and admonishes the world not to touch this sacred principle of unlimited "freedom of debate." The venerable age of this foolish precedent shall not save it from the just charge of imbecility and legislative vice.

The power to obstruct the will of the people by the Senate rules is the last ditch of privilege.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. OWEN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BRISTOW. I desire to inject there that, in my judgment, the rule against which the Senator from Oklahoma is contending has been the rule that has protected the rights of this country far more than the rights of the people have ever suffered. Instead of being the last resort of privilege, it is the hope of the minority when it contends against an injustice.

Mr. OWEN. At a future day I will demonstrate the fundamental error that lies in the argument of the Senator from Kansas, but I can not permit him at present to divert me from my present argument or break into the middle of my sentence with a speech.

In the House of Representatives the party in power with its majority is carrying out the will of the majority, permitting reasonable debate and wide publicity to the views of all Members. But in the Senate, while we have reorganized the committees and have made important improvements in the rules, there still remains the point of unlimited debate, of irrelevant debate, of dilatory motions, whereby the minority can still prevent the action of the majority placed in power by the people. The United States Senate is the only place where the people's will can be successfully thwarted, and here it can be obstructed and denied by delays, by dilatory motions, by irrelevant debate, and unlimited discussion.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. OWEN. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator speaks of the transaction of business in the House. Is the Senator prepared to say that a larger proportion of the measures introduced in the House are passed there than is the case in the Senate? Further, is he prepared to say that when we finish a session the House has done more business than the Senate, and the calendar of the House is clearer than that of the Senate, or is the calendar of the Senate clearer than that of the House?

Mr. OWEN. Answering that question, I will say that any large body, such as the House, which introduces, relatively to the number of its members, a much larger number of bills, has a much larger number of bills undisposed of. But that does not in any wise abate the force of the argument I am presenting.

Mr. WARREN. One moment further. As a matter of fact, does not the Senate pass more bills than does the House in a session?

Mr. OWEN. It is much easier for the Senate to pass bills, because of the smaller number of Members of the Senate. It is

easy to pass unobjected bills in the Senate; and there are a great many bills that are brought up in the Senate that are unobjected bills. But I will say to the Senator that objected bills do not pass through the Senate.

The new majority of the Senate is honestly pledged to the people's cause, and they must carry out their pledges if they wish to retain the approval of the people of the United States.

I am in favor of majority rule.

I am in favor of making the national will immediately effective.

I am in favor of the Senate of the United States having the opportunity to do the things required by our great Nation.

I am opposed to the minority veto.

I am opposed to the discouragement of honest discussion by the invitation to minority filibuster which this rule of unlimited debate invites.

I am opposed to legislative blackmail, which this rule of unlimited debate encourages, for we have all seen the Senate consent to appropriations and important amendments to important bills which ought not to have been made, but which were made rather than jeopardize the bill by the endless debate of a Senator proposing and insisting on an amendment.

The minority veto permits the majority to be blackmailed on the most important measures in order to conciliate the unjust demands of the minority. The time has come to end this sort of unwise parliamentary procedure with its train of evil consequences.

I believe in the freedom of debate. I invite the freedom of debate; but liberty is one thing and gross abuse of liberty is another thing. Freedom of debate is a valuable principle, worthy of careful preservation, for the majority is often instructed by the minority; but freedom of debate is one thing, and uncontrolled time-killing talk and unrestrained verbosity used to enforce a factional veto is another thing.

The amendment to Rule XIX which I have proposed does not prevent reasonable debate by any Senator, but it does permit the majority, after due notice, to bring a matter to a conclusion whenever it has become obvious that the debate is not sincere, but is intended to enforce a minority veto.

Senator Vest, December 5, 1894, well said:

That these rules "coerce the Senators in charge of a bill into silence."

That "with the people of the United States demanding action we have rules here that absolutely prevent it."

That these rules "facilitate parliamentary blackmail."

That the history of the Senate is full of important amendments being put upon important bills, "under the threat that unless placed there the debate would be indefinite and almost interminable."

This rule has brought the Senate of the United States into disrepute, has greatly diminished its influence, has given it the reputation of being an obstructive body; and many men have been led to believe that the Senate was coerced and controlled by a corrupt minority. Certain it is that if a minority can exercise the veto, the corrupt interests of the country could well afford commercially to promote the election of men to the floor of the Senate, so as to obstruct legislation to which they objected.

It is the result of these very rules which has led the people of the United States to demand by a unanimous voice the direct election of Senators, so as to bring public pressure of the sovereign people on individual Members of the Senate, and compel them to respect the wishes of the people, under penalty of retirement from public life.

I pause here to say that for 90 years the people of this country have been trying to establish the rule of direct election of Senators, and it has always been the Senate that has prevented the people from having their will with regard to this matter. Five times the measure passed the House of Representatives, the last two times almost by a unanimous vote of the Members representing the people of this country in the various congressional districts; yet the Senate stood like a stone wall, refusing under these rules to carry out the will of the people of the United States. The same thing has been measurably true in regard to many other important items.

I venture now, Mr. President, seriously and solemnly to remind every Senator upon this floor who votes against this provision, who votes against majority rule in the Senate, who votes against a reasonable control by the Senate itself of its own deliberations, that he will have to answer for such vote before the people of his State, who will in the future elect the Senators by direct vote of the people and who will nominate them by direct vote of the people. And the Senator who by virtue of any precedent or prejudice opposes in this body the free right of the

majority to rule will invite defeat by the majority of the people in his own State who surely believe in majority rule and will resent the support of minority rule by their Senators on this floor.

I have no fear of majority rule. I never have been afraid of majority rule. The only thing we need to fear is the rule of the minority by artifice and by wrongdoing. And I say frankly to my colleagues from the South that the black-and-white scarecrow of the force bill is a ghost for which I have no respect. We are entering a new era of majority rule, which will deal justly and generously to rich and to poor alike, and with equal generosity, justice, and mercy to men of the black race, as well as to the men of the white race, or to any other race. We need have no fear of majority rule.

Mr. President, I wish it to be clearly understood that my demand for a change of the rules of the Senate is not at all due to the idea that the adoption of such a rule is necessary in order to pass the tariff bill or any other particular bill pending or to be brought forward. My reason for this demand is that I think the welfare of the Nation requires it; that the right of the American people to a prompt redemption of party promises is involved. The right of the American people to have their will expressed at the polls promptly carried out I regard as an imperative mandate from a Nation of 90,000,000 people, and I think that a Senator who stands in the way of that mandate fails to perceive his duty to our great Nation, and that he should not be surprised if the majority, who will in future nominate Senators and elect Senators, will hold him to a strict account for a denial of the right of the majority to rule.

I remind the Senate that in three years over 30 living Senators who opposed the wishes of the American people for the direct election of Senators have been retired by the people.

PARTY PLEDGES.

The Democratic Party makes certain pledges to the people and appeals to the people for their support upon these pledges promised to be performed; the Republican Party does likewise; yet neither party, if in a majority, can control the Senate so long as the minority veto remains as a part of the rules of the Senate. If this rule is not changed, then both parties in future campaigns should put the following proviso as an addenda to their national party platforms.

Provided, however, That in making the above pledges to the American people it is distinctly to be understood by the people that we make these pledges on the understanding that the opposite party does not forbid us to carry out our promises by obstructing the fulfillment of our promise to you by filibustering in the Senate, in which event we will agree to sustain the right of the opposite party to veto the redemption of our pledges to you, by leaving the rules of the Senate in such a condition that the opposing party may veto our effort to redeem the promises made to you.

If the party trusted by the people is so imbecile as to leave the Senate itself subject to the veto of the defeated party it will deserve future defeat for such perfidious conduct.

The people of the United States have the right to rely upon the party placed by them in power to fulfill the party pledges made to the people, and if the leaders of both parties connive with each other in the Senate to sustain the minority veto under the pretense of "freedom of debate" they will have betrayed the promises made to the people, both expressed and implied. If this rule be not changed so as to establish majority rule in the Senate, and so as to enable either party to carry out its promises to the American people, then neither party responsible for such conduct deserves the confidence of the people of the United States, and the people may well say in regard to party promises made under such circumstances, as said by Macbeth in the witches scene—

And be these juggling fiends no more believ'd
That palter with us in a double sense;
That keep the word of promise to our ear
And break it to our hope.

With the consent of the Senate I submit as a part of my remarks, without reading them, several resolutions drawn by Senator Vest, Senator Platt, Senator Hoar, and others.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. OWEN. Senator Vest, of Missouri, in 1893 introduced the following resolution, the most moderate form of terminating so-called debate (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 45, Dec. 5, 1894):

Amendment intended to be proposed to the rules of the Senate, namely, add to Rule I the following section:

"SEC. 2. Whenever any bill, motion, or resolution is pending before the Senate as unfinished business and the same shall have been debated on divers days, amounting in all to 30, it shall be in order for any Senator to move that a time be fixed for the taking a vote upon such bill, motion, or resolution, and such motion shall not be amendable or debatable, but shall be immediately put; and if adopted by a majority vote of all the Members of the Senate, the vote upon such bill, motion, or resolution, with all the amendments thereto which may have been

proposed at the time of such motion, shall be had at the date fixed in such original motion without further debate or amendment, except by unanimous consent, and during the pendency of such motion to fix a date, and also at the time fixed by the Senate for voting upon such bill, motion, or resolution, no other business of any kind or character shall be entertained, except by unanimous consent, until such motion, bill, or resolution shall have been finally acted upon."

Hon. Orville H. Platt on September 21, 1893, introduced the following resolution (p. 1636):

Whenever any bill or resolution is pending before the Senate as unfinished business the presiding officer shall, upon the written request of a majority of the Senators, fix a day and hour, and notify the Senate thereof, when general debate shall cease thereon, which time shall not be less than five days from the submission of such request, and he shall also fix a subsequent day and hour, and notify the Senate thereof, when the vote shall be taken on the bill or resolution and any amendment thereto without further debate, the time for taking the vote to be not more than two days later than the time when general debate is to cease, and in the interval between the closing of general debate and the taking of the vote no Senator shall speak more than five minutes, nor more than once, upon the same proposition.

And, among other things, said:

The rules of the Senate, as of every legislative body, ought to facilitate the transaction of business. I think that proposition will not be denied. The rules of the Senate as they stand to-day make it impossible or nearly impossible to transact business. I think that proposition will not be denied. We as a Senate are fast losing the respect of the people of the United States. We are fast being considered a body that exists for the purpose of retarding and obstructing legislation. We are being compared in the minds of the people of this country to the House of Lords in England, and the reason for it is that under our rules it is impossible or nearly impossible to obtain action when there is any considerable opposition to a bill here.

I think that I may safely say that there is a large majority upon this side of the Senate who would favor the adoption of such a rule at the present time.

Mr. Hoar, of Massachusetts (1893), submitted to the committee a proposed substitute, as follows (p. 1637):

Resolved, That the rules of the Senate be amended by adding the following:

"When any bill or resolution shall have been under consideration for more than one day it shall be in order for any Senator to demand that debate thereon be closed. If such demand be seconded by a majority of the Senators present, the question shall forthwith be taken thereon without further debate, and the pending measure shall take precedence of all other business whatever. If the Senate shall decide to close debate, the question shall be put upon the pending amendments, upon amendments of which notice shall then be given, and upon the measure in its successive stages according to the rules of the Senate, but without further debate, except that every Senator who may desire shall be permitted to speak upon the measure not more than once and not exceeding one hour.

"After such demand shall have been made by any Senator no other motion shall be in order until the same shall have been voted upon by the Senate, unless the same shall fail to be seconded.

"After the Senate shall have decided to close debate no motion shall be in order, but a motion to adjourn or to take a recess, when such motion shall be seconded by a majority of the Senate. When either of said motions shall have been lost or shall have failed of a second it shall not be in order to renew the same until one Senator shall have spoken upon the pending measure or one vote upon the same shall have intervened.

"For the foregoing stated purpose the following rules, namely, VII, VIII, IX, X, XII, XIX, XXII, XXVII, XXVIII, XXXV, and XL, are modified."

Mr. Lodge, of Massachusetts, also then, as now, Senator of the United States from Massachusetts, supported this proposal, using the following language (p. 1637):

It is because I believe that the moment for action has arrived that I desire now simply to say a word expressive of my very strong belief in the principle of the resolution offered by the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. Platt.

We govern in this country in our representative bodies by voting and debate. It is most desirable to have them both. Both are of great importance. But if we are to have only one, then the one which leads to action is the more important. To vote without debating may be hasty, may be ill considered, may be rash, but to debate and never vote is imbecility.

I am well aware that there are measures now pending, measures with reference to the tariff, which I consider more injurious to the country than the financial measure now before us. I am aware that there is a measure which has been rushed into the House of Representatives at the very moment when they are calling on us Republicans for non-partisanship which is partisan in the highest degree and which involves evils which I regard as infinitely worse than anything that can arise from any economic measure, because it is a blow at human rights and personal liberty. I know that those measures are at hand. I know that such a rule as is now proposed will enable a majority surely to put them through this body after due debate and will lodge in the hands of a majority the power and the high responsibility which I believe the majority ought always to have. But, Mr. President, I do not shrink from the conclusion in the least. If it is right now to take a step like this, as I believe it is, in order to pass a measure which the whole country is demanding, then, as it seems to me, it is right to pass it for all measures. If it is not right for this measure, then it is not right to pass it for any other.

I believe that the most important principle in our Government is that the majority should rule. It is for that reason that I have done what lay in my power to promote what I thought was for the protection of elections, because I think the majority should rule at the ballot box. I think equally that the majority should rule on this floor—not by violent methods, but by proper dignified rules, such as are proposed by my colleague and by the Senator from Connecticut. The country demands action and we give them words. For these reasons, Mr. President, I have ventured to detain the Senate in order to express my most cordial approbation of the principle involved in the proposed rules which have just been referred to the committee.

Senator David B. Hill, of New York (1893), proposed the following amendment (p. 1639):

Add to Rule IX the following section:

"SEC. 2. Whenever any bill or resolution is pending before the Senate as unfinished business and the same shall have been debated on divers days amounting in all to 30 days, it shall be in order for any Senator to move to fix a date for the taking of a vote upon such bill or resolution, and such motion shall not be amended or debatable; and if passed by a majority of all the Senators elected the vote upon such bill or resolution, with all the amendments thereto which may be pending at the time of such motion, shall be immediately had without further debate or amendment, except by unanimous consent."

Only last Congress, April 6, 1911, the distinguished Senator from New York, Mr. Root, introduced the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules be, and it is hereby, instructed to report for the consideration of the Senate a rule or rules to secure more effective control by the Senate over its procedure, and especially over its procedure upon conference reports and upon bills which have been passed by the House and have been favorably reported in the Senate. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 47, pt. 1, p. 107.)

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, before the Senator from Oklahoma takes his seat, will he allow me? I notice that in the early part of his argument he referred to the fact that all, or nearly all, of the States of the Union in their several legislative assemblies limited debate, and he also referred to nearly all the parliamentary bodies of Europe as limiting debate.

Mr. OWEN. As having the right to limit debate.

Mr. POMERENE. In the course of his investigations did the Senator find any parliamentary bodies which do not limit the right of debate?

Mr. OWEN. I did. I found Greece.

Mr. POMERENE. Was there any other country?

Mr. OWEN. I found no other. Canada did have at one time unlimited debate, but since they have become more intelligent they have adopted cloture.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go to the Committee on Rules.

BANKING AND CURRENCY.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I ask unanimous consent that an article by Mr. R. C. Milliken concerning banking and currency be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President—

Mr. CLAPP. I rose to the request of the Senator from Colorado. Has it been acceded to?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do not know whether it was submitted or not. I have asked for unanimous consent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair inquired whether there was any objection to printing the matter in the RECORD.

Mr. SHAFROTH. If there is any objection—

Mr. CLAPP. I do object for the present. I wish to confer with the Senator further.

Mr. SHAFROTH. All right. Then let it be deferred.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—TARIFF DUTIES ON SUGAR.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

When the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] was speaking recently on the sugar tariff—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 19, page 1580—I engaged in a colloquy with him, and in the heat of debate made the following statement:

Mr. ASWELL, a Member of Congress from my State, went out West and made a number of speeches for the party, and in getting his instructions at Chicago from the national campaign committee he was told, so I am informed, that he must not discuss the question of free sugar.

This information was conveyed to me in the haste of the debate by Representative BROUSSARD, of Louisiana, who sat by me.

Within the past week I have been informed by Representative ASWELL that this statement was incorrect, and that he never received any such instructions from the national campaign committee. In fact, he said, to quote his exact words, "I understood that the Baltimore platform was the basis of discussion and so acted without any limitations offered by any person connected with the national campaign committee." Hence, I infer that Mr. BROUSSARD must have been misinformed.

I have also been advised by Postmaster General Burleson that he was in charge of the speakers' bureau at Chicago; that he instructed the various speakers himself; and that none of them was told "not to discuss the question of free sugar."

In view of what these two gentlemen say I am convinced that my statement was erroneous, and hereby correct it.

I also desire to say that no remarks of mine made during the aforesaid debate on sugar, which ran through parts of three days, were intended to impugn the motives or acts of the standard bearer of my party.

I wish it clearly understood, however, that nothing I have here said is to be construed as changing the main line of argument of my speeches, to wit, that the Baltimore platform did not contemplate or provide for free sugar.

THE TARIFF—PANIC OF 1893.

Mr. THOMAS. I desire to give notice that at the close of the morning business to-morrow I shall speak upon House bill 3321 and the relation of the Wilson Tariff Act to the panic of 1893.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. BACON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 10 minutes spent in executive session, the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, July 15, 1913, at 2 o'clock p. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 14, 1913.

SECRETARIES OF LEGATIONS.

H. F. Arthur Schoenfeld, of the District of Columbia, now third secretary of the embassy at Constantinople, to be secretary of the legation of the United States of America to Paraguay and Uruguay, vice Richard E. Pennoyer, nominated to be secretary of the legation at Lima.

Richard E. Pennoyer, of California, now secretary of the legation to Paraguay and Uruguay, to be secretary of the legation of the United States of America at Lima, Peru, vice Alexander R. Magruder.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Charlton B. Thompson, of Kentucky, to be collector of internal revenue for the sixth district of Kentucky, in place of Maurice L. Galvin, superseded.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Charles A. Mansfield, of Williston, N. Dak., to be receiver of public moneys at Williston, vice Minor S. Williams, term expired.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Robert T. Menner to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 15th day of June, 1913.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 6th day of June, 1913:

Richmond K. Turner,
Henry F. D. Davis,
Eugene E. Wilson,
Francis T. Chew,
William R. Munroe,
John F. Shafroth, jr.,
Walter L. Heiberg,
Charles L. Best,
Allan G. Olson, and
John C. Jennings.

The following-named citizens to be assistant surgeons in the Medical Reserve Corps of the Navy from the 7th day of July, 1913:

William H. Massey, citizen of Nevada, and
David S. Hillis, citizen of Illinois.

Carpenter Theodore H. Scharf to be a chief carpenter in the Navy from the 19th day of April, 1913.

Asst. Surg. Joseph J. A. McMullin to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 28th day of March, 1913.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 14, 1913.

CONSULS.

North Winship to be consul at Owen Sound, Ontario, Canada.
Nathaniel B. Stewart to be consul at Milan, Italy.

ASSISTANT APPRAISERS OF MERCHANDISE.

James Fay to be assistant appraiser of merchandise in the district of New York.

Frank S. Terry to be assistant appraiser of merchandise in the district of New York.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Edward J. Lynch to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Minnesota.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF PENSIONS.

Edward C. Tieman to be Deputy Commissioner of Pensions.

POSTMASTERS.

COLORADO.

Clark Cooper, Canon City.

MICHIGAN.

George B. McIntyre, Fairgrove.

Perry H. Peters, Davison.

Harry L. Shirley, Galesburg.

John J. Sleeman, Linden.

TENNESSEE.

O. L. McCallum, Henderson.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, July 15, 1913.

The Senate met at 2 o'clock p. m.

The Rev. Collins Denny, D. D., of Richmond, Va., bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, offered the following prayer:

O Lord, we acknowledge Thee as the God of our fathers. We thank Thee for the way in which Thou hast led this people. We pray Thee to keep us mindful of the fact that we are constantly needing Thee. Show us the weakness which is so characteristic of us, how readily we yield to temptations to which we are subjected, how greatly we need what Thou alone canst give to us.

And now grant to the men who are here in large and responsible positions all the help they need to fulfill the obligations that rest upon them. And grant also to the people whom they represent that they may be moved with the right spirit to give support and encouragement and loyal fealty to those who are here representing in the Capital of the Nation the great affairs of this people.

Above all, we pray Thee that Thou wouldst make us Thy people, a people after Thine own heart, free from the evil that tears down national life, and clothed with the righteousness that gives perpetual existence to the people who follow after Thee.

May the blessing of God rest richly upon every Member of this Senate, upon the entire National Government, upon the whole people. We ask for Jesus' sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

CHARLOTTE J. HUSTED AGAINST THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 133).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact and conclusion filed by the court in the cause of Charlotte J. Husted, widow of Henry Husted, deceased, *v.* The United States, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

MAY STANLEY.

Mr. BRYAN. I am directed by the Committee on Claims to report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 1644) for the relief of May Stanley, and I submit a report (No. 81) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to know from the Senator what the claim is and upon what basis a payment is asked.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Stanley was superintendent of the Indian reservation. There is a very full report prepared by the supervisor sent to investigate the matter.

Mr. GRONNA. We can not hear the Senator on this side.

Mr. BRYAN. I say, the bill is based upon the death of the superintendent of an Indian reservation. The appropriation for the amount carried in the bill was incorporated in the Indian appropriation bill and passed by the Senate, but it was stricken out in conference.

The facts, briefly stated, are that Stanley, the superintendent, when on a visit to the reservation, was murdered. Five or six Indians were tried and convicted for the murder. It seems from this very full report that some of them had formed a conspiracy to murder the superintendent when he came to the reservation. Mr. Stanley lingered after having been shot for 8 or 10 hours. He was attended by physicians and every attempt possible was made to save his life, but he died. The bill includes an appropriation to pay the physicians.

Mr. SMOOT. The House objected to the insertion of it in the appropriation bill?

Mr. CLAPP rose.

Mr. BRYAN. The Senator from Minnesota can state fully about the matter.